

THE VIEWS OF A LAYMAN

IN THE UNITED
INTEREST OF THE
WEST & THE EAST

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
1. INDIAN HISTORY AND ITS LESSONS - -	1
2. THE RESOURCES OF INDIA - -	7
3. INDIA AND TURKEY - - -	10
4. THE NATIVE STATES - - -	14
5. POLITICS AND THE WAR - - -	23
6. A PLEA FOR UNITY - - -	25
7. THE INDIAN STATES - - -	31
8. THE BLIGHT OF DISTRUST - -	35
9. INDIA LOQUITUR - - -	41
10. STRIKES IN INDIA - - -	61
11. THE PUNJAB MAIL ... - - -	63
12. THE PRESENT UNREST - - -	65
13. MUSINGS OF A WANDERER -	70
14. EXCESS & MODERATION - - -	74
15. THE KHILAFAT - - -	82
16. THE STATE OF INDIA -	86

1. INDIAN HISTORY AND ITS LESSONS.

THE History of India comprises events which can teach many a lesson but it seems that it is not generally read to advantage, and it may safely be said that its careful study would be an experience of some value. This experience is at the disposal of any one willing to learn, and it is such that one requires very few years to acquire. On the other hand those who have read this history thoughtfully cannot have failed to discover what the real causes are which account for all that India has undergone in passing through the various stages it has done. To the writer it seems that most of the sufferings of this country in the past have been due to the following causes —

- (1) Absence of a consistent and well-considered policy resulting in a defective administrative system
- (2) Want of confidence in officers
- (3) Selection of wrong men by the rulers
- (4) Want of judgment on the part of rulers preventing discrimination and breeding a proneness to swallow interested reports
- (5) Absence of check on intrigue
- (6) Absence of even-handed justice
- (7) Absence of earnest attempts to establish peace
- (8) Absence of free trade
- (9) Want of disinterestedness on the part of those connected with the administration of the country

- (10) Want of religious toleration.
- (11) Inattention to the extension of trade and commerce.

These, to my mind, are a few of the principal causes which prevented the consolidation of the country, assimilation of races and the growth of wealth and culture

Without attempting the unnecessary task of proving that the causes set forth have operated to produce the results ascribed to them, it may be said at once that many of the shortcomings of the past have been remedied under the enlightened British rule

As a justification of India's past most readers will probably ask the question "What about other countries?" Were they not as backward as India in most respects? It must be admitted that some of the other countries in the earlier stages of their development suffered equally with India, from similar causes, but be it said to their credit that they helped themselves, remedied the defects of their body politic, and prospered. Not so India, nor would she have risen above her traditions, had it not been for the present Government

The secret of the success of the other countries which have prospered lies in the following circumstances —

- (1) A clear grasp of aims and objects and a sustained endeavour to increase the wealth and improve the general prosperity of the country
- (2) Sinking of personal differences as well as personal interests, in all matters which appertain to the welfare of the country
- (3) Organisation of tribunals and prompt dispensation of justice
- (4) Adoption of methods calculated to make and keep the masses loyal.

- (5) Dissemination of education alike among males and females, and careful training of the future generation
- (6) Careful guarding of the rights and interests of the country.

Now, it will be admitted that those conditions were not present in our dear India of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Why? Principally for want of union

Bye-the-bye, in respect of union it cannot be said that India has improved very much. Strained relations between Hindus and Mahomedans still exist, and frequently during the Hindu or Mahomedan festivals there are exhibitions of bitter and unbecoming differences between professors of the two religions, who, by virtue of belonging to the same country and having resided with each other for centuries, should be like brothers

No one will be inclined to maintain that these 'shows' are signs of a healthy nation or conducive to the continued prosperity of the country. On the contrary, to my way of thinking the existence of ill-feeling between the two communities is a real misfortune and shows that the ill-luck of the country has not yet disappeared

If such feelings exist, how can business flourish, and how can members of the two communities associating with each other in all walks of life pull together? Fortunately, however, these differences are confined to urban populations and do not affect the village populations or what are contemptuously called, Dehatilogs

It is a well known fact that in out of-the-way places in the Deccan, no bad feelings exist between Hindus and Mahomedans and that there is very little difference in their ways their customs the language and their ceremonies. And why is this? Simply because these places are outside the reach of intriguers and enemies of the country. There are people who are ex-

tracely quick and clever, but not far sighted enough to see the remote and ultimate consequences of certain acts and events. They are generally very ambitious and enthusiastic and often act merely from want of occupation. Failing in far sightedness they often act as enemies of their country. The recent occurrence in Calcutta (Bukī Id), which may be regarded as an historical event, cannot but set one thinking and asking what is the cause of all the trouble. It could not be said that the Mahomedans started anything new, for the custom now objected to is an ancient one. Then again are there not slaughter houses in most of the towns old established institutions? In the time of the Moghuls who could have objected to such a celebration as the Bukī Id?

Interference with the rights or religion of others is neither wise nor a mark of toleration. It should also be remembered that public roads are not the property of individuals or classes, but that every one has an equal right to them. Certainly the objection on the part of the Hindus would have been just and legitimate if there had been any deliberate intention on the part of the Mahomedans to wound their feelings. But this cannot be laid at the door of the Mahomedans. How many Hindus have not taken to beef eating? The conduct of such is logically more offensive to Hindus than that of the Mahomedans of Calcutta during the Bukī Id. No public demonstration of indignation has been known against the action of such beef eating Hindus. One thing must be said viz that the fault does not lie entirely with one side but with both, for our Mahomedan brethren with as much prejudice, and no more reason, have objected to Hindu processions (rightly attended with music) passing by their mosques. Why should they object? The public roads are not their exclusive property. Far more objectionable disappointing and detrimental to the interests of the country

was the feeling evoked in some quarters by the appointment of Mr Sinha in 1909 Does not the word 'Indian' cover all creeds and classes of the country? And as long as an Indian was appointed to the Legal Membership, was it not sufficiently gratifying for the Indian community? If any one venture to answer "No," I would say that the curse which has been upon India's devoted head is still there It has almost passed into a proverb that the Indian genius is *destructive* and not *constructive*, and one is constrained to admit that it is a just reproach!

Some one observed some time ago, to the great satisfaction of those who heard it that there are a few places in India where Mahomedans and Hindus look upon each other as brothers and where there is no distinction made between them They live happily together respect each other's customs, whether religious or social the festivals of the one community being joined in by members of the other I hope I may be permitted to say here what would in another context be a more truism, that the God of nations is one God and that we all have to go into His presence to render our accounts

Earthly religions are different for the lights of the prophets were different but those great teachers all received their inspiration from the One Source, whom some call Rama and others Rahim Why then, so much jealousy ill-feeling and intolerance? And all in the name and for the sake of the God who has enjoined virtues the opposite of these lower passions When will this blind ignorant prejudice vanish and these petty differences disappear? The Lord help us! If people will only remember the common source and the common objective of all religions, the day may soon come when we shall be a happy nation

Under the benign rule of the British we all are enabled to maintain our rights and individual privileges and to live like brothers, in amity and concord.

It would be a slur on our religion, a profanation—a sacrilege—if, in spite of the freedom with which we are allowed to meet, and the absence of the tribulations and persecutions of old days, we cannot be one in sympathy with the spirit of give and take

Rather than fight and fret what I think behoves us is to adopt such measures as will improve the general condition of the country and smooth all differences For example—

- (1) Adoption of the Panchayat system and reduction of expensive litigation
- (2) Wider spread of education on sounder lines
- (3) Bringing about a better understanding between the rulers and the ruled
- (4) Avoidance of provoking and offensive language and a frank and straightforward representation of real, and not imaginary grievances
- (5) Adopting concerted measures for the prevention of famines and epidemics, which carry off thousands periodically

In conclusion, I beg my readers to forgive me if I have seemed to preach or to find fault My sole anxiety has been for the good of the country, and nothing else

God, help us all in our honest endeavours in this direction

(Published in the "East and West" in March, 1911)

2. RESOURCES OF INDIA.

A Word to the Country.

It has been truly said that there is no unmixed evil in the world .

There is no doubt that this horrid war has ruined thousands of families and thrown them into misery, but at the same time it has opened our eyes to one important fact viz ,—what reliance can be placed upon the resources of this country

It is undeniable that in many respects we have to depend upon supplies from countries in the West, some of which for a long time have not displayed a friendly disposition towards the British Empire and one of which, at any rate is our inexorable enemy to day

Therefore, to the extent of our dependance upon other countries we are not a self-supporting country But at any rate now the time has thus come when, as far as our own requirements are concerned something must be done to make India self reliant

Not only are we dependant for certain articles of manufacture, but what we ourselves could produce we are not able to do now Centuries ago many things were made in this country, though only by the hand or according to the old recipes transmitted from father to son But ever since machinery came aided by scientific processes, hand labour failed to compete with the West, and naturally this country has ceased to manufacture most of the articles it was once famous for, this is not all even the processes we knew have now been nearly forgotten

This terrible war has amply proved that if the im-

per of materials and stuffs is ever stopped we would find ourselves in a very sad plight indeed

A few instances may be cited to show how far we are dependent upon the countries of the West —

(1) We can't make any machinery in this country as well and on such scale as in the West

(2) We can't make dyes most varieties of cloth and a thousand other things which are in daily use

We are very fortunate to be under a most gracious Sovereign and his Government which is entirely sympathetic. It is surprising therefore that the mechanical arts and other devices for meeting the needs of this country have not yet attained adequate development. Of course no Government can ever do what the people themselves must do. The Government can only adopt administrative measures and introduce conditions which favour the growth of industries trade and commerce. Thus the Government have to a certain extent done are doing and will no doubt continue to do. It is for private enterprise to do the rest and thus make this great country entirely self supporting. There is no doubt that the interests of all parts of the Empire are thoroughly identical. This identity of interest would appear to dictate the policy of protecting the trade of the Indian Empire against foreign competition and not of the one part against the other. Therefore any measures involving the latter form of protection are worthy of the serious consideration of the generous Supreme Government.

It is regrettable indeed and also very painful to see what sacrifices our brethren of England are making in prosecuting this war and that we in this country can do so little to come to their rescue in any effective sense. If only to-day we had the requisite class of concerns and factories in this country with local labour trained to carry them on, we would have been proud to help our brethren and relieve them of the strain and anxiety they are suffering.

Is it not a shame that we can't get many of the medicines, woollen stuffs, machines of innumerable kinds and myriad other things, as for most of these we depend to a great extent upon the odious Germans? Men and money are here, but not the training and the organisation that can turn them to the most important of accounts

It seems a pity that even our large and well-organised Chambers of Commerce have so overlooked this point for want of a little foresight and a deeper interest in the country

It is hoped that the writer will be forgiven this presumptuous effort to bring a most vital and important point to the notice of the Government, the commercial community and also the numerous Chambers of Commerce. He prays to God that the day may soon come when India will be fully prepared to compete in business with the foreign countries in every respect. It is hardly necessary to say that by foreign countries the writer means countries outside the British Empire

In conclusion the writer would express his sense of pride at the honourable part this country has played in the war in co-operating with its brethren of the West and in supporting them in every way possible. May all this lead to the best of feelings and the happiest of relations

(Published in "The Times of India" dated 23-7-1915)

3. INDIA AND TURKEY.

An Indian statesman of high position writes to us on the subject of Indian Moslems and the continued participation of Turkey in the war. He points out that at heart the Moslems of India are grieved to find the Islamic State at war with the British Empire and her Allies, and suggests that they should help to terminate this state of affairs by jointly urging on the Turkish Government the desirability of making peace. We put the suggestion forward, because it comes to us with authority, and because it contains the germ of a possible beneficial course. None recognises more fully than those who understand them best the hard case of Moslems in this war. The Sultan of Turkey is Kaliph, and if he is surrounded by bad advisers, he is none the less the Kaliph. Turkey is the first Islamic State and any blows which fall on Turkey are, to a certain extent, blows which affect the territorial position of Islam. Whether, they affect the real and the spiritual interests of Islam is another matter, there is no reason to enter upon the discussion of it here. At the same time the vast majority of Indian Moslems see that Turkey, having been dragged into the war by Germany, in circumstances which are only gradually being understood, becomes the common enemy of the Allies, and it is necessary to deal with her as vigorously as is possible in the prosecution of the war. There is inevitably this constant struggle between the respect in which Moslems naturally hold the Kaliph and the first Islamic State and their loyalty to the King and to the Empire, whose future is indissolubly associated with the defeat of Germany and her Allies. Nothing would give both the Moslems of India and all

true Imperialists, more satisfaction than the ending of this conflict, and the conclusion of peace between Great Britain and her former Ally, Turkey. Anything which would contribute to this end is a matter which commands our earnest sympathies, the more because of the resolute courage with which the Moslems of India as a whole have faced the difficulties of their position, and which makes the lapses of the few the more lamentable by comparison.

Surveying the field as a whole, we can discern no fundamental cause of difference between the Allies and the Turkish Empire, any more than there was when before the fatal attack on Odessa the Allies guaranteed the independence and integrity of Turkey. The one thorny issue which was raised when the Turkish fleet, acting under orders from Berlin, and in opposition to the views of many of the most distinguished men in Turkey, who were kept in ignorance of these intrigues, opened fire on the Russian ports, was the future of Constantinople. We have always maintained that of the Allies the interests of Russia in Constantinople were so much more important than those of the other States concerned that they should predominate in council. The interests of the British Empire are bound up with the preservation of a strong and independent Turkey. Great Britain has no other interest than to see both Constantinople and the guardianship of the Straits under Turkish control. Having fought one war to maintain these conditions, and having been ready in 1878 to fight another rather than see the integrity of the Turkish Empire menaced, it is obvious that despite the changed conditions on the road to the East, a Turkish Constantinople is the truest British interest. Now through the revolution in Russia, the Constantinople obstacle has been removed from the path to peace. The present Government in Russia—so far as there can be said to be any Government—has expressly

repudiated all aggrandising designs in the direction of the Turkish Empire. Thus the great bone of contention has been removed. Certain difficulties have been raised through the attempts of Turkey against Egypt, and against the friendly State of Persia, but we confidently believe that there is none which are incapable of solution, if they can be settled between the Allies and the Turkish State, freed from foreign interference. Certain guarantees might be necessary to secure the Christian races left under the government of the Porte from the fate which befel the Armenians but approached in a spirit of resolute determination to find a *media* we do not think that any constitutes an insuperable obstacle to peace. Certainly in the present stage of the war in Asia Minor and the known internal conditions of the Turkish Empire, the attempt is worth making, and if the Indian Moslems, through making their influence felt, can contribute to this end, they will be rendering their co-religionists in Europe and in Asia Minor, who are suffering so grievously from the prolongation of the war, the greatest of services.

The difficulty lies not in any fundamental clash between the interests of the British Empire and those of the Turkish State nor in any clash between the Allies of the British Empire and those of the Turkish State, but in the fact that Germany has secured complete control over Turkey. Enver Pasha and his immediate colleagues are not Ministers of Turkey, but the Ministers of Germany. All who differed from them have been ruthlessly suppressed. Nevertheless there are strong elements in Turkey still entirely opposed to the present regime. They look beyond the war, they ask themselves anxiously what will be the position of Turkey after the war, if Germany can claim anything approaching either victory or stalemate. Studying the history of modern Germany, they see all too clearly

that any State which stands athwart the path of Germany is stamped down. Denmark and the Duchies of Schleswig Holstein; Austria and her nominal hegemony of Germany; Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina—these States stood in the way of the realisation of the ideas of the Pan-Germans, therefore they had to be overborne. In like manner Turkey stands in the way of the Pan-Germans, through Byzantium to Baghdad. If there are any Turks, or Moslems, who believe that Germany will be content to pursue these ambitions through a strong and independent Turkey, rather than by trampling over her, they must be singularly blind both to the whole history of Germany since the sixties, and to the teachings of those who made the war and are prolonging the war in the last hope of huge aggressions. Turkey has been relieved from one menace through the revolution in Russia. We fear that she has saddled herself with a far more real and deadly enemy through her entanglement with Germany. It will be far more difficult to cut a path through this barbed wire than to resist the advance of Russia; her one chance of doing so is to shake herself free now. There are, we have good reason to believe, many distinguished Turks who hold these views, but they are powerless under the iron heel of Germany and the Turks through whom she is acting. A strong manifestation of sympathy from their co-religionists in other parts of the world might strengthen their hands. It is of course a question for the Moslems themselves to decide, but we think they might well ponder on the advice given by a great Indian patriot which we have made the basis for the discussion of these considerations.

(Published in "The Times of India," dated 15-12-1917).

4. THE NATIVE STATES.

A Few Plain Facts.

Friends and countrymen,—Knowing your sympathy and deep interest in the well-being of this country and its people, whether big personages or of lowly position, I make bold to lay before you a few simple ideas for your sympathetic and earnest consideration. What has led me to do so is that as one moves about the country, from time to time and reads the responsible journals, one cannot help feeling that there are in the air certain vital misconceptions, affecting the important interests of the country.

The shibboleth, if not the bugbear, of the day is the cry for 'Home Rule' and an offshoot of it is an extraordinary feeling between British India and the Princes of India.

When one goes to British India one hears the people there say pointedly that they have nothing to do with the Indian States and the complement of this sentiment is expressed by the Rulers. Then it is that those who are well-wishers of both (they may not parade their sympathy and yet it may be deep down in their hearts) feel driven to pray that the mist which obscures comprehension may be cleared and the learned politicians vouchsafed a more distinct vision of the goal. It is the confusion of ideas in the alleged conflict of interests which is truly responsible for arresting the progress of the country. I feel sure that if the problem is examined in all its bearings it will be certainly realised that there is not, after all, the absence of common interest which is assumed.

ONE COUNTRY.

Now let us make an analysis of this question, not forgetting that the relations of the States with the old 'John Company' and therefore with His Majesty the King Emperor are governed by Treaties and Engagements, and see whether the fact of such relations creates any difficulty, so far as our dealings with our British Indian fellow-countrymen are concerned, or operates to remove our essential identity of interests. The Treaties, after all, secure to the Princes and their peoples a measure of independence, and thus place the former above the ordinary wealthy person or a big land holder, further they are protected by the grace of God and the kindness of the Sovereign and his Government in some special respects

Now it cannot be denied that the speciality of their position and their privileges is a matter of history, and the resources of the Indian States, barring few exceptions of reward bestowed in the name of the Emperor as "Shahi Atiya," are the joint ancestral acquisitions of these Rulers and their people. But none of these privileges or attributes, it must be remembered, has the effect of depriving the Indian Rulers or their people of their Indian nationality.

I do not suppose there can be two opinions on this point. After all, we all belong to the one country and have so much in common, even the fact of forming parts of the one portion of the King's Empire called India. We are Indians first and anything else afterwards, so much so that when the really harmless word "Native" is applied contemptuously by some supercilious amongst our fellow-subjects, it is applied as well to the Indian in the State as to the Indian in British India. So if the European makes no difference between us why should we ourselves? (On the question of this word

"Native," I for one do not see the point of its use even colloquially, in preference to the more natural and seemly word "Indian." Is not the European in his own country a native, but he is spoken of as Englishman, Irishman, Scotchman, Frenchman, Italian, etc. An Englishman going across to France does not speak of the people as "Natives.") Then where is the dividing line between "British India" and "Indian States"? Their interests must be the same, and it would be difficult to say where they vary. Then again the Ruler of a State apart, his subjects are bound to have many ties with people in British India, through relationship, through common interests in property, through a thousand and one points of contact arising out of the business of life, financial, commercial, etc.

It would hardly seem necessary to dilate on this point, but if its significance were clearly realised, the misconception I have referred to at the beginning, would soon disappear. Thus there is common interest, and also mutual, though not always apparent, interference and I maintain that this reciprocal action and reaction is healthy, because without such mutual interest and interference, which luckily are impossible to avoid, isolation must result and progress must come to a halt.

COMMON INTERESTS

I shall now explain what I mean by maintaining that there are common interest and interference between the people in the Indian States and in British India.

1 *Interest*—This arises, as I have said, from ties of blood and other such ties. Have the Indian Rulers and their subjects no caste fellows and relations in British India? Then what about financial or commercial relations without which the everyday business of life cannot be carried on. A Ruler or his subjects must

often form matrimonial ties in British India and enter into business relations every day and hour. Now supposing a Ruler, or his Sardar or any one of his subjects or their relations in a State meets with trouble, whether on account of business or other cause, are those in British India interested with any one of these by one of the many possible ties not going to render help whether financially or by influence? Naturally they will

2. *Interference*—By this I mean negotiations or stepping in to put such matters right as relate to caste questions or matters of religion, not to speak of the moral influence brought to bear in a thousand and one ways, whenever either in British India or in a State there is an inclination to go off the track. Such negotiations and such intervention, such questions and such influence result in a variety of compromises, and these are all examples of healthy interference, necessitated by community of interests.

In these circumstances, I fail to see how could it be said that British India and the States represent two entirely separate interests or how it could be seriously believed that people on either side of the imaginary barrier, genuinely desire to keep aloof from one another. Thus interests being common, British India and the States must take an interest in one another, not in the sense of combining politically to uproot the present Government but by uniting to work for the general advancement and prosperity of the country and its people. Lately it has been affirmed with great and perhaps unnecessary insistence that the States and British India should have no hand in their respective affairs. I venture to doubt the wisdom of this sundoring policy. People of the same country who have everything in common must not be artificially ranged in opposite camps, simply on account of the accident of being under different administrations on the contrary

they must keep themselves and their interests together, which are common and mutual as shown already.

HISTORIC RIGHTS.

It must not, however, be forgotten that the States are by an ordainment of Providence entrusted to the care of their Rulers, and therefore the Rulers are bound to have their own internal organisations to govern and advance them. The Rulers, of course, are under an obligation to make their administrations what they should be, characterised by proper arrangements for defraying justice, absence of corruption and the expenditure of the bulk of public revenues upon ameliorating the condition of the people.

Also I consider that incidentally it is the duty of every Ruler, in fact he owes it to his people who with the territories and the revenues derived from various sources, constitute the State, to insist upon the maintenance in their integrity of the special position, privileges and prerogatives enjoyed from of old and secured by Treaties and engagements with the British Crown. But so far as I can see in all this there is nothing to prevent the States and British India working conjointly, nor is it intelligible why before British India would allow the States to be associated with it in the general advancement of the country, the former should insist upon dragging the latter down to its own level, particularly when it is considered that what British India is, in a sense, after, is to attain the autonomy possessed by the States. Therefore, I think it is the bounden duty of the statesmen both in British India and the "Indian India" if I may so call it, to pull together harmoniously, working jointly for bettering the position of each other, for effecting necessary improvements, and for brightening mutual esteem.

WHAT OF THE STATES?

One has often heard the complaint that the affairs of the States are a sealed book, and generally they are condemned as centres of misgovernment. Side by side with the pronouncement of this verdict one notices great professions of love for the motherland and manifestation of a readiness for self-sacrifice for the advancement and good of the country. But one is still waiting for a single instance of earpest self-effacement or active altruism exhibited by migration into a State with the set purpose of reforming it tacitly and on the right lines, that is, with due regard to local conditions whatever they may comprise. One is so tempted to ask the question how many people outside the States know them as they really are? and to suggest that sometimes people might go a little out of their way and try to see things for themselves.

Therefore, I say it is the duty of people both in British India and the States to endeavour jointly to better each other's condition by bringing defects to the notice of the Government of India and the Government of the Rulers. To put matters right so as to bring prosperity to the country and secure the well-being of the people on whose hard labour—and I might say intelligence—the Government and Rulers depend for their own bread and butter, should be the ultimate goal of all conscientious and earnest people.

UNFAIR CRITICISM.

To revert to the Rulers of States, I make bold to say that they are in a most unfortunate position. All sorts of charges are levelled against them. I have heard people sometimes say that their officers are bad. Well I want to know the place where all officers are exceptionally good. The next story is that business cannot flourish under personal government because a despotic

Ruler may send away his good officers or defy laws at will or refuse at any time to be constitutional. This may have been true in the years gone by, but it is certainly not true to-day, as the Rulers of States are now far from being sunk in the depth of positive barbarism. Believe me, my dear friends and countrymen, such aspersions are meaningless and such doubts have no longer any foundation in fact. As for mistakes, do not the cleverest make them sometimes? Well then, the Ruler is only human and does not profess or claim to be above the deficiencies inherent in humanity.

In conclusion as a well wisher of the country, of both British India and the States I desire to express the hope that I shall be corrected if I am wrong. If some kind person, after pondering over what I have said, feels convinced that there is nothing in my plea of co-operation and show me where I have gone wrong I shall be grateful indeed, but if on the other hand it should be discerned that I am generally right I sincerely hope that endeavours will be made to dissipate the misapprehensions and progress towards the goal will be made by mutual invitations to take interest in the affairs of each other.

REAL HOME RULE

I suggest, if the idea be considered feasible, that on both sides offers be made of representation on the Councils and thus honest criticism invited, if the need be felt for such a step. Personal interest, useless or superficial criticism for self-advertisement, I daresay, would be objected to anywhere. But anything making for general prosperity (which includes development of agriculture and commerce, promotion of general education and technical knowledge etc etc) will, I feel sure, be heartily welcomed and carefully considered. The ad-

mission of representatives from British India to their Councils by the Indian States will, I trust, go a long way towards removing the suspicion which unfortunately exists, *viz*, that the States conduct their affairs irresponsibly and are intolerant of honest and independent criticism

It will be objected, how many States have Councils and are advanced enough to entertain such a proposal? But never mind, there must be some, and if a start is made in one, an example of this nature will be so impressive that the other will be bound to come into the scheme. This at any rate would be the natural anticipation

This is what I call real "Home Rule," the setting of one's house in order, the practical acknowledgment of one's country as one's home, with an endeavour to improve and beautify, and not to heap implications upon as the cursed dwelling of a nasty neighbour

Real and close interest in the welfare of the country under the aegis of the Sovereign and the management of the Government is the thing to develop. It is obvious that such interest cannot be created without affording scope for co-operation and giving a helping hand

At present what is being done is not perfectly healthy, as it leads more to controversy and bad blood than to anything else. It cannot lead to the zone of happiness or the sphere of good-will which every one desires heartily to see achieved. Some means must be devised to bring the Government and the people together with perfect understanding, hearty good will and unqualified unity of purpose

To gain the peoples' good-will rests largely in the hands of the Government and their advisers, and therefore it is their duty to be wise and just and discriminating, that is the crown of loyalty to the Sovereign. Superficial things produce evanescent effects but with

solid things the result is abiding. Prejudice and the want of level-headedness might spoil a great opportunity.

One word more. There is no doubt that India is advancing in material civilisation and her people have begun to take more interest in their affairs; but for want of experience they are in need of correction and guidance. The play of human forces must be taken duly into consideration and the necessary balancing must be done. The people must be educated and given scope for employing their talent; and by distinguishing themselves exhibit a sense of duty towards the Sovereign and the Government as well as the people of the country. Such matters as do not relate to foreign politics and few other things, but to their own internal affairs, might well, with certain safeguards, be entrusted to the peoples' management.

God bless the King and his people.

(Published in "*The Times of India*," dated 20-12-1917).

5. POLITICS AND THE WAR.

A valued correspondent writes to say that whilst moving amongst the people assembled at the Delhi Conference, he found a strong feeling that if Indian politicians were asked to drop all agitation during the period of the war, then equally the counter agitation in India and in England should be dropped too. He goes on to say that the proposition is a very healthy and sound one, and commends its adoption to all parties concerned. To that opinion all reasonable people will cordially subscribe. In this world one-sided bargains are of little or no use, they are rarely respected and they are repudiated at the first opportunity. The essence of an enduring arrangement is that it should be fair to both parties, and it is not fair to ask Indian politicians to drop their activities, whilst leaving those who differ from them free to prosecute their own propaganda. Our own view, which we expressed on the morrow of the Delhi Conference, is that the abandonment of political activities during the war is of less importance than that any political activity that is developed shall not disturb the fundamental unity of this land in the resistance of foreign aggression. For the measure of our danger is the measure of our unity, united we shall reduce the menace which we have to face, for the enemy may not be able to mobilise the forces of disturbance on which he relies in opposition to a united India, if he does, then they will be defeated. But we have no hesitation whatsoever in subscribing to the doctrine of our correspondent, that the pact, which is necessary for our unity and for our concentration on the mobilisation of the resources of India for the defence of India and of the Empire, must embrace all classes or

none In the present stage of Indian development the counter-propagandists, whether in India or in England, are just as much the enemies of political peace as the Home Rulers. There is just one other point which we should like to touch upon, it deals with those who expected, and tried to demand, at Delhi an emphatic pronouncement on the constitutional development of India Now in all discussions, there is no more valuable quality than what the French call *le sens de la politique*, which is quite another thing from political sense, it is rather political instinct What is the exact position, within the knowledge of all who care to read the daily papers? It is that Mr Montagu, and the Government which he represented in India, were under a definite pledge to Parliament, the supreme arbiter in this issue, not to commit themselves to a scheme of Indian reform until Parliament had been consulted The Secretary of State left India shortly before the assembly of the Delhi Conference, it was obviously impossible for the Viceroy to make any pronouncement whilst the considered scheme was on the high seas A *sens de la politique* would have prevented both the expectations which were entertained and the effort which was made to precipitate a declaration We have every confidence that the scheme which the Viceroy has worked out in conjunction with the Secretary of State will be a generous and progressive one, fulfilling in the spirit and in the letter the policy towards India which the Government has foreshadowed, but its first disclosure must be to Parliament

(Published in "The Times of India" dated 10-5 1918)

6. A PLEA FOR UNITY.

Tolerance and Manners.

The present condition both of England and India is no secret. Nor is it any secret how widely divergent are the points of view of some Englishmen and Indians at the present moment.

It is a trite saying that there is a time and occasion for everything. It is equally proverbial that extremes are always undesirable. The question therefore arises "What are the measures that should be adopted to ensure, if nothing better at any rate the early termination of this war, which has involved every one in misery"? One thing is certain, and it is that this consummation can be attained only when the people of the Empire are united. But it is a deplorable fact that whenever an attempt is made to close the ranks something arises—perhaps we should say, is deliberately started—which renders such a necessary and salutary attempt completely nugatory. It appears as if very many people are out to attain their own ends, but the same amount of effort is not expended on the larger good of the country, which is the far more important consideration. This is indeed lamentable.

It has come about that excepting through the medium of the Press there is no other way of approaching the public and of putting to them the vital question. "Is it good for the body politic that we should be divided and disunited at the present time?" But what is to be done when petty jealousies and undignified bickering mar the face of this the only available means of educating the public mind; in short when those who ought to be most

responsible, who ought to entertain the liveliest sense of their grave public obligations, take their responsibilities lightly and positively abuse their privilege and their opportunities? It is perfectly amazing that some of those responsible for the public discussion of momentous questions—whether Englishmen or Indians—should not realise that the present is a *crisis* one in which it can be most appositely said, “united we stand divided we fall”. Is this the highest conception of the loyalty of the country—that the present situation unsatisfactory as it is, should be exploited by the publication of exasperating and irritating comments? To what extent can people, who thus unsettle the public mind *accentuate differences* and intensify discontent, be looked upon either as loyal to the Government or well wishers of the country which they all profess to love and to serve? The most extraordinary feature of the situation is that difficulties are created in the way of the Government to which we owe the liberty, nay, the license of free speech

LET UNITY ABIDE

have gained in this country a certain mastery over those that make for cohesion and evolution. Apart from the causes that may have contributed to this result, it is safe to say that the phenomenon which we are observing is only natural to human nature.

Those who have the real good of the country at heart are bound to pray as well as to strive for the eradication of all that is disruptive, and for the restoration of an atmosphere in which unity can abide and progress can thrive. This is only possible when the leaders of thought and the public press of the country confine themselves to what is sensible and of primary importance. To those who are truly loyal to the throne of England, the observation will appeal with irresistible force, that the present is not the time for indulging in actions which are calculated eventually to weaken the foundations of the monumental structure which has been raised in this country by the industry of many centuries. On the contrary, there can be no denying the fact that the present is eminently the time in which all differences must be sunk and a thorough union of hearts established. If the state of the social heart which we have idealised does no other good it will at least help to bring to an end this ravaging and draining war.

MANNERS AND MEN.

We were stricken with complete amazement when we read the editorial remarks in *The Madras Mail* of the 6th of May. The demand for Home Rule and all the acerbity of feeling associated with it is, in a very large measure, the result of a very simple cause viz the treatment of Indians. Those who have had the privilege of coming into contact with their Western brothers in England itself cannot help being struck with the difference between their behaviour and that of some of their countrymen who have come to this country, either to serve as officials

or to claim the reward of their business instincts by engaging in commerce. Has this patent fact never occurred to the responsible public Press of this country, and if it has, could it not have applied itself long ago or at any rate can it not apply itself even now to the rectification of this fruitful evil? We should imagine that the innate sense of responsibility with which every journalist worthy of his calling must be credited, and the splendid opportunity of rendering a real and a unique service to the country, ought to have brought home to the editors and contributors of all respectable newspapers in India their duty in this important direction. We have no doubt that if the public Press were even now to devote itself to this question and were to bring to bear upon its endeavour no more than the qualities of justice and fearlessness, it would do far more good to both parties to the Home Rule agitation than it does by indulging in diatribes against the protagonists. We attach the greatest importance to the Press rendering this service, because we honestly feel that if no improvement takes place soon in this respect, then disastrous consequences may follow which will be beyond the power of diplomacy to avert. Our business as detached spectators is to sound the necessary note of warning: it is for those who handle affairs to pay heed or utterly disregard.

BRITISH INDIA AND THE STATES

To revert to *The Madras Mail* of 6th May, we presume that the Princes and Rulers of Indian States will find that contribution rather to their liking because so far as their action in regard to the war is concerned, there are words of appreciation to be found all right. We, however, respectfully invite attention to an article which appeared in *The Times of India* of April 27th. We think the observation that Indian States and British India represent separate interests requires deep con-

sideration We entirely agree with the view that the relation between the people of British India and the States is so close that it is idle to speak either of disparity of aims or of the absence of identity of interests. If the view we urge be not accepted all transaction of business must come to a standstill.

It is of course a platitude that the prosperity of a country depends primarily upon good government and progressive commerce. If the one fifth and the four-fifths of Indians in the Native States and British India respectively were treated as representing two separate and contending interests then the trade of the country would be eventually placed in hopeless jeopardy. Union and toleration are as essential for purposes of successful commerce as they are needful for the subsistence of a well knit society.

If, therefore, the present tendencies and modes of thought as are manifested by the various sections of British India endure for any length of time, is it likely that the inclinations and sympathies of the States will continue to be what they are? There devolves, therefore upon the public Press a very onerous and a very sacred duty, viz., that of continuing to enlist and retain the goodwill and sympathy of Indian States, and of seeing that it is not forfeited or alienated, otherwise if the present helpful attitude of the States is replaced by an apathetic or even indifferent one—of dissatisfaction and disappointed hopes, a great responsibility will rest upon the head of the public Press.

We are convinced that the Rulers of the States will religiously guard against such an unfortunate contingency, but even they must carry, like the British Indian Government, the masses of their people with them. The retaining of public confidence is a problem of the gravest import.

It is much easier to do harm than good. Is it too

much to expect of the public Press of the country to give serious thought to the human phenomenon? Such of them as are the true well-wishers of the country and therefore of the Government, are bound to do so. They cannot and for that matter no one can afford to forget that the bread and butter of the highest amongst us ultimately depends upon the public and what they contribute to the national wealth. Such is our appeal and such our prayer and may the All-Highest grant the people and residents of this country the supreme blessings of wisdom and sobriety.

7. THE INDIAN STATES.

Find out the Truth.

Since a long time the accepted belief in British India about the Indian States is not favourable to them. Their methods of administration are regarded as archaic and incapable of affording opportunities for growth and expansion. This is unfortunate. It is true that prejudices die hard. Nevertheless no serious attempt seems to have been made to find out the truth about the States. They have not stood still during the last fifty years. Vast changes have been brought about—the spirit of progress is abroad, old things are constantly yielding place to new. Of course, perfection is no more claimed for the Indian States than for any other administration or organisation. But in the States as elsewhere endeavours are being made to move on towards better things, and the writer is sure that any well-informed criticism will be welcome to the States, for all such criticism is healthy and makes for progress. But this is only possible when conditions are well studied. For it must not be forgotten that the States have been progressing and most of them keeping pace with the times. It is a question of weighing advantages and disadvantages and then striking a balance.

Criticism founded upon preconceived notions and merely to show oneself off cannot be of any help or productive of good. For there is nothing so easy as to find fault with anything one may like.

This is the age of industrialism and not a few of the States have recognised the necessity of commerce and industry. As far as one can see they are anxious that

people from British India should start commercial and industrial enterprises in their dominions. And it may be presumed that they would not hesitate to afford even financial assistance under proper and reasonable safeguards. But it is a matter for regret that people have not yet taken the trouble to ascertain the facts. This can only be attributed to the old standing prejudice against the States. The present writer will be the last to deny the existence of defects, but it should not be forgotten that defects of one sort or another exist everywhere. Given the desire for improvement and the necessary intelligence to differentiate between good and bad there is no defect that is not capable of being removed. Man makes mistakes and then rectifies them.

I think it is only fair and in the general interests of all that prejudices relating to the Indian States should be removed from the minds of the people generally. Information may be gleaned of the activities of the States from their annual reports which practically all of them issue but it is feared they are not studied.

However of late not a little attention seems to have been paid to the States but not in the direction indicated above. The spirit of reform is abroad and there are not a few who would reform the States practically out of existence or so mutilate them and alter their character and status as to render their existence as States merely a matter of name. In your leader of the 5th instant you have dealt with an essay by Mr. Nanjundayya. The summary of the essay as given in your article appears to reveal the absence of historic sense and of proper grip of certain fundamental facts and principles. Mr. Laya-kat Ali in your issue of the 7th instant has done well in calling attention to one important aspect of the question. Our reformers of the present day in their zeal seem to forget that there are such things as treaties in existence between the British Government and the States, the

solemnity and sanctity of whose character have been repeatedly affirmed by all responsible British statesmen. But our reformers by completely ignoring their existence would seem to treat them as less than scraps of paper.

Moreover, putting aside the question of treaties the assumption on which Mr Nanjundavva's propositions are based do not appear to have much relation to fact. To refer to one matter only, he seems to think that the principle of self-determination is of universal application and is capable of solving any and every political problem. He seems to forget that it assumes the existence of homogeneous and self-conscious peoples, and that in mixed or backward communities it is absolutely unworkable. Take the case of Ireland. The British Government left it to Irishmen themselves to determine the form of government they would like to have and they have utterly failed to find a solution.

Political problems should be judged calmly and in relation to realities, and it will never do to be carried away by fine catch words and phrases. Defects there are bound to be in any organisation and its working, but such defects should be rectified in the light of better knowledge and experience. Indian States have at least one merit in their favour and that is the test of time. They have been in existence for centuries and the writer is unaware of any desire on the part of the people of the States or even of British India that they should be wiped off the slate. They have at any rate done one thing they have afforded Indians opportunities of training in statesmanship which they did not possess elsewhere and that is no small service that the States have rendered to India.

The writer cannot help thinking that for all those who deal with such subjects, it would be wiser, before venturing to give publicity to their views, to consult and discuss the question in all its bearings with some persons

of knowledge, otherwise the danger is that the public who specially on such questions, take their opinion ready made by those who write for the public Press, would be misled, and the responsibility of such people is great

(Published in The Times of India, dated 13 6 18)

EQUALITY OF TREATMENT

We do not disbelieve that what the people of the country really desire is equality of treatment and opportunity, and this we unhesitatingly say is at once a natural and a legitimate desire—equality in the conferment of Government offices where the necessary qualifications are possessed, equality of opportunity to participate in the counsels of State and the latter form of recognition must necessarily be attended by a willing readiness to adopt and carry out any useful practical suggestions made. So far as the people in authority in England are concerned there is luckily room for the belief that in the transaction of this country's business they are ready to apply and practise the principle enunciated. But what is rather surprising is that some among the leading public men of England should be found, in the present times, to declare a divorce between themselves and their national traditions as well as their previous personal professions and by rather a dramatic volte-face to adopt a line of action contrary to the expectations they had raised. There are instances of people who have actually held high offices in the country and in that capacity proved themselves to be its earnest well-wishers, but who on retirement have taken up an attitude utterly inconsistent alike with the best interests of this country and with their own reputation for far-sighted statesmanship. This is much to be regretted. As a matter of fact we regard such instances in the light of India's misfortune.

AN UNWISE POLICY

But in an analytical view we believe that what they ask the Government to concede, and what they are prepared to concede in favour of the Government, is what is in accord with the present stage of the country's progress, and therefore fair. A great deal has recently been talked about the governance of India on Colonial lines. In view of the disparity of conditions between India and the Colonies such a claim may be at once dismissed as inept. Similarly, if people subscribe to the policy—the notorious policy—of certain construction engineers (which is so to exaggerate their estimates as eventually after the reduction of their demand to be left with an amount still in excess of the requirements of the work in hand), we actually feel no hesitation in condemning the policy as both unwise and dis-ingenuous.

THE MORAL OF THE WAR

India has afforded ample proof of her loyalty and her fidelity, and the conditions and happenings of the last four years have equally clearly helped to demonstrate her poverty and her helplessness. If the resources of this country had only been fully developed, not only would her assistance to the Empire been far more effective than it has been, but further the financial and economic drain which has been imposed upon her would have been saved, and the enrichment of other countries which the War has occasioned at the expense of the British Empire would have been her own enrichment. But the saddest moral of the War is the utter economic dependence of India, occasioned by the degree of the undevelopment of her resources and the complete lack of the capacity to organise in the face of an emergency, all which is ultimately traceable, if the truth must be spoken, to the lack of trust and the failure to associate the country's talent with the powers that be.

The bane of all government is red-tape but in India red-tape and mistrust have been so much in the ascendant that they have rendered the timely fruition of all ameliorative schemes frankly impossible. Nothing can be effected at the psychological moment perhaps in regard to certain far-reaching but imperative measures of public utility it will be no exaggeration to say that several official generations have to pass before a practical policy can be evolved and carried into effect. In other words, to put a plain truth plainly, the delays occasioned by red-tape and the discouragement following upon distrust have thoroughly marred and effectually retarded and impeded the progress of the country. Let those who are blessed with judgment clearly realise—and the sooner they realise the better—that India is neither such an ingrate nor so faithless as it suits the purposes of some to make out that she is.

INDIA'S LOYALTY.

Have not recent years crowded as they have been with awkward situations and potentialities awful to contemplate, unmistakably proved the devotion of India to her August Sovereign, has not her unequivocal behaviour demonstrated her loyalty and her unflinching determination to cast in her lot, for better or for worse, with her friend and guardian across the waters? Can any body misread the events or ignore the signs of the times? India has not only spoken unequivocally during these trying years, she has reinforced her words with

secretly desires the severance of this providential connection, re-call to their minds the scenes of 1911 and the outbursts of enthusiastic loyalty which proclaimed to the wide-world India's hope and India's aspirations and how they centred in the person of her majestic Emperor, who condescended to visit her in that year.

No country in the world is free from an element of lunacy, but it is a question of degree and proportion. In India, luckily for her, the malady is not widespread, and even more luckily for her she has been recently provided with object lessons—need them she did not—of the awful consequences following upon the securing of freedom by the removal of moral manifestations of the wrong spirit which one may have recently observed in this country, are the direct results of imported ideas—ideas gleaned haphazard from books and newspapers and therefore divorced from all facts and considerations of practical possibilities. These ideas, however, are only evanescent and confined to hair-brained individuals, who might however be forgiven for the sake of their congenital defective vision. The chances are that their vision will improve when they realise that the evil deeds of other peoples have brought them no good. Anyhow, whatever there is out of tune which has resounded in India is merely an echo, a reflected note and not the true and genuine shout.

On calm reflection it would appear that the demands of the people of this country are after all neither so preposterous nor so full of terror for the future as some interested people in England are endeavouring to prove that they are. They merely ask for fair play and to be allowed and enabled to go forward. What this demand generally stated amounts to in detail has been briefly sketched at the beginning of these reflections.

We shall conclude these musings unflinchingly in the characteristic Oriental style. A grave crisis evokes

the prayerful mood and we do not propose to resist the impulse which is on us to end by saying that the Dispenser of all Bounties may in His wisdom vouchsafe discrimination, judgment and good sense to the warring elements, and thus render possible for India her emergence from the crucible as pure and refined gold. May He grant that the mist of despair lift and the clouds of distrust disperse leaving India and England, and for that matter the East and the West, united in heart and in purpose marching steadily on to the goal of self-realisation through which they may attain to their Maker and their God.

(Published in "The Times of India," dated 25-11-18)

9. INDIA LOQUITUR.

The Lord be thanked for the dawn of the day which had been longingly expected for four years and more. We may find comfort in the thought that millions of lives have been saved which may have been sacrificed if the War had continued. Not only that, but many anxieties have come to an end, many troubles have ceased, and peace unhindered by any restrictions is happily now in sight. The people of the world may once again devote themselves to peaceful avocations.

What else has the intervening hand of Providence brought about? or at any rate let us hope, may bring about? First that the rightful will come into their own. Next, that the fate of cruelty and faithlessness will be a warning and an object lesson to the world. Lastly that the unprincipled enemy having been brought on his knees, aggression and encroachment will hereafter be things of the past.

The goddess of justice lent her scales, one side to Might and the other to Right. We of the living generation are lucky to have witnessed the weighing with our own eyes and to have seen the balance inclining on the side of Right. The staggering events of the last four years have also demonstrated that Providence transcends all human designs and that ultimately Righteousness alone doth triumph.

Is it not a miracle that has been worked? Will the short-sighted still refuse to see that

“Our acts our Angels are,
for good or ill,
Our fatal shadows that walk
by us so!”

Lest we forget we can only render a good account of ourselves and live at peace with ourselves and the world, as long as we keep in the Divine presence and obey the Laws ordained by the Almighty. He knows what is in our innermost hearts, the deepest motives it is impossible from Him to hide.

Fear the Lord thy God whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with all thy heart and all thy might. These are prescribed and together supply a rule of life compliance with which leads on to good fortune. So long as this brief code is followed there is forgiveness of misdeeds after due repentance. But to forget the All Highest is to meet with trouble at every step.

There is safety in remembering His Commands. Where there is the fear of God, there is all that is gracious in human nature—honesty, justice, goodness and the most pleasing of manners. But all these virtues vanish the moment selfishness steps in. All the dissonances that are rending the world are clearly the result of misguidedness and this misconception of the real duty is manifested in a variety of ways. In some instances it takes the form of taking no notice of people's sufferings or of not readily relieving them. In others it is exhibited by the jeopardising of public interest for the sake of personal fame or self-glorification. Either line of conduct is inconsistent with true humanity.

We may well appeal to people to bethink themselves of the wail which suffering sends up to heaven. We may well remind them that there is a limit to human patience. How long can human beings put up silently with iniquity? And, further, even if there be no justice in this world, there is justice in the hereafter. The imprecations of the suffering will one day surely evoke an ample response and the people responsible for inflicting misery would have to answer for their deeds. For, be it remembered that every act of every man is

recorded in a scroll with the exactitude with which a phonograph registers all sounds. It is strange that, so often, people profess sentiments which are worthy of angels but when it comes to action even these men behave as if they were something less than human.

To justify oneself before the seat of Supreme Judgment is by no means an easy matter. It is much more difficult than the proverbial cracking of a hard nut. True glory is the reward of self-effacement only, and God approves of the conduct of only such men as have feared him and tried to do right.

Apparently there is in the world, a great diversity of religions and of the rules of conduct, but really there is no difference between them because they all aim at the one thing, namely, to know and realise God. The differences in the various religions and the conduct prescribed by them are due merely to the fact that the "Law givers" sought to suit their teaching to the natural and other conditions which they found in their time. As all rivers ultimately fall into the sea, so all religions eventually unite in the Common Hall of Justice which is the Court Divine. But the wise of the present age fail to grasp this eternal truth, and by inventing various shibboleths only divide society into factions. Viewed in detail the province of religion is very extensive, but certain principles may be deduced which if acted upon in daily life will bring contentment here and tranquility hereafter. These are here expressed in the form of injunctions or commandments —

- 1 Thou shalt worship with all thy heart the Lord thy God
- 2 Thou shalt remain devoted to God's Viceregent thy King
- 3 Thou shalt follow thy religion
- 4 Thou shalt protect all other faiths than thy own and take interest in them

5. Thou shalt maintain complete control over all thy appetites and desires.
6. Thou shalt be generous of disposition and within thy means charitable
7. Thou shalt make thyself instinct with sympathy.
8. Thou shalt falter not in thy righteous decisions.
9. Thou shalt eschew anger, jealousy and greed.
10. Thou shalt be patient under all that overtakes thee.
11. Thou shalt respect thy elders and superiors.
12. Thou shalt listen intently and with sympathy to what anyone has to urge but shalt do only that which thou believest to be right.
13. Thou shalt order all thy affairs with wisdom.
14. Thou shalt love the truth and therefore love justice.
15. Thou shalt faithfully fulfil thy promises.
16. Thou shalt work for and maintain union.
17. Thou shalt duly punish the wrong-doers.
18. Thou shalt not be lowly minded.
19. Thou shalt endeavour to be modest and yet far-sighted.
20. Thou shalt forbear from meanness in any form.
21. Thou shalt be true to thy salt.
22. Thou shalt endeavour to bring joy where misery is
23. Thou shalt not lend thy ear to calumny.
24. Thou shalt not forget what thou art.
25. Thou shalt honour the honest and the faithful.

Although the wisdom of these injunctions lies on the surface, yet the intellectuals of the present age will not readily subscribe to them. Rather they would stigmatise them as morbid and weak-kneed sentiments which are responsible for arresting the progress of India.

This condemnation would be in accord with the prevailing mental attitude, which demands that every

proposition shall be scientifically demonstrated in a laboratory or on a black board before it can be regarded as worthy of acceptance. It may be observed, however, that the matters to which the foregoing injunctions relate are neither geometrical propositions nor problems in algebra which can be proved in the manner suggested.

This is not to suggest that the truths laid down are incapable of proof only, they require a different board for the purpose of their demonstration. They can be worked out on the tablet of the heart.

Also we may remind the faithful worshippers of ratiocination that the world takes many things on trust, because the sources from which they arise are believed to be trustworthy. As a matter of fact, if everybody insisted upon proof of everything, the world's business would come to a standstill. Then again the principles which have been here enunciated are such as anybody can prove for himself so far as their utility is concerned, on the other hand the process of their deduction is not within the capability of every man. That requires great application and self-effacement. Certainly the process is not within the capacity of a 'fashionable gentleman'. At the same time, if a person applies himself to penance and purification of the heart, and devotes at least, as much time and earnest attention to the matter as is given to taking the degrees in science or literature he may hope to convince himself that the afore stated injunctions are as true as any scientific laws.

The joy to be derived from such application transcends all the pleasures that are usually sought after, and yet the attainment of the perfect life would appear to be the object for which we are born in this world.

In contrast with this, the conditions of life in the present times appear to be perfectly amazing. People seem to be all in the air and will not condescend to set foot on *terra firma*. They run after sha-

dows and care not for substance. What is worse, they let go the real for the sake of the imitation article. Any how, it is some comfort that such an angle of vision is confined only to a limited circle. The pity of it is that unity is non-existent and differences of opinion exist even amongst the smaller groups and bodies. Again each group and party wishes to be in the ascendant. The consequence is that impatience reigns, there is dissatisfaction on every side, so much so that there is no agreement even between people of the same persuasion. Every one tries to be number one. Sincerity is a discarded virtue. What is professed by the lips is not necessarily in accord with that which is deep down in the heart.

Home Rule and Reform are at present the watch-words of the people. In this connection it seems worth while to draw attention to the scheme exhibited by Nature. In Nature we do not find uniformity, instead we find diversity of type. Nay more, variety of species would appear to be favoured by Nature. Not only are people of various countries ethnically different but in consequence of their varying environment they also differ in temperament. These circumstances naturally give rise to varying customs and traditions, no less than to different religions. Even the *flora* and *fauna* of the different parts of the globe differ from each other. Wherefrom it seems permissible to conclude that local conditions must determine the type specially suited to any country or people in every respect. This is confirmed by the fact that we do not find uniform conditions prevailing even in different parts of the same country. To take a homely illustration, Bengal produces plantain while Kashmir produces saffron. Who does not desire the ideal? But is this practicable?

What applies to the vegetable kingdom also applies

to the realm of administration. The same system does neither prevail everywhere nor would appear to be entirely suitable to all parts of the country. Take for example the land revenue system. We find the Zamindari system existing side by side with the Ryotwari. All these differences of type suggest the inference that the conditions to be found in the different countries were created or brought about by Divine or human wisdom with an eye to their special suitability. What is, therefore, suitable for one country or people is not necessarily suitable for another. It is this conclusion from the order of Nature which makes the demand for Homo Rule so unintelligible.

Numberless people, before now, have felt the same disaffection towards diversity in Nature, and vainly tried to alter her scheme. Similarly, innumerable wise heads have laboured, in the past, to have one language, a common religion and an uniform system of administration for the whole world, but to no avail. Such efforts do not promise ever to prove anything else than futile. The fact of the matter is that however high human ambition may soar, human capacity is only limited. How can man in such circumstances, hope to change the very order of Nature?

Reflection shows that all that is in Nature is founded upon some profound principle or other. One of her laws is that there shall be diversity of type. If in place of this rule there was sameness, if for example all men had the same face and the same disposition, how could there be any relative progress? There would not only be a dead level in all matters in all countries, but to push the illustration home no wife would know her husband, nor a child his parent.

There must, therefore be some inscrutable purpose behind what we see, as for example, the survival of the

dows and care not for substance. What is worse, they let go the real for the sake of the imitation article. Any how, it is some comfort that such an angle of vision is confined only to a limited circle. The pity of it is that unity is non-existent and differences of opinion exist even amongst the smaller groups and bodies. Again each group and party wishes to be in the ascendant. The consequence is that impatience reigns, there is dissatisfaction on every side, so much so that there is no agreement even between people of the same persuasion. Every one tries to be number one. Sincerity is a discarded virtue. What is professed by the lips is not necessarily in accord with that which is deep down in the heart.

Homo Rule and Reform are at present the watch-words of the people. In this connection it seems worth while to draw attention to the scheme exhibited by Nature. In Nature we do not find uniformity, instead we find diversity of type. Nay more, variety of species would appear to be favoured by Nature. Not only are people of various countries ethnically different but in consequence of their varying environment they also differ in temperament. These circumstances naturally give rise to varying customs and traditions, no less than to different religions. Even the *flora* and *fauna* of the different parts of the globe

to the realm of administration. The same system does neither prevail everywhere nor would appear to be entirely suitable to all parts of the country. Take for example the land revenue system. We find the Zamindari system existing side by side with the Ryotwari. All these differences of type suggest the inference that the conditions to be found in the different countries were created or brought about by Divine or human wisdom with an eye to their special suitability. What is, therefore, suitable for one country or people is not necessarily suitable for another. It is this conclusion from the order of Nature which makes the demand for Home Rule so unintelligible.

Numberless people, before now, have felt the same disaffection towards diversity in Nature, and vainly tried to alter her scheme. Similarly, innumerable wise heads have laboured, in the past, to have one language, a common religion and an uniform system of administration for the whole world, but to no avail. Such efforts do not promise ever to prove anything else than futile. The fact of the matter is that however high human ambition may soar, human capacity is only limited. How can man in such circumstances, hope to change the very order of Nature?

Reflection shows that all that is in Nature is founded upon some profound principle or other. One of her laws is that there shall be diversity of type. If in place of this rule there was sameness, if, for example, all men had the same face and the same disposition, how could there be any relative progress? There would not only be a dead level in all matters in all countries but to push the illustration home, no wife would know her husband nor a child his parent.

There must, therefore, be some inscrutable purpose behind what we see, as for example, the survival of the

and standing invitation to Nihilism Socialism, Communism and Anarchism How far this is desirable may engage the thoughtful, suppose that India gets Home Rule Is anybody prepared to aver that all misery will disappear and all disaffection will come to an end? Most certainly not There is no doubt, however, that if Home Rule comes, the leaders of that movement will have great cause for satisfaction as they will be able to have a finger in most pies and to count themselves amongst the foremost people of the country

It seems the order of the day that such as have the courage of conviction and unflinchingly speak the truth are ruled out of court Now worse they have to hide their diminished heads But those who are ready to say ditto to anything are the ones that swim on the tide of popular favour Much time is now a days spent in ridiculing each other—what hope can there be of improvement in conditions so characteristically wasteful

produce a form of government akin to Home Rule. Of course, the problem is not easy of solution. But in our opinion, if the following principles are applied, great satisfaction will be rendered to the people. The measures suggested will come as a balm to sore hearts and the task of administration will be greatly facilitated.

While superior power should be retained by the rulers in their own hands, the public should be induced to apply themselves to the promotion of the country's good. This, of course, consists in the prosperity of the people. To bring about this end, it will doubtless be necessary to remove all restrictions which stand in the way of material advancement. The people will thus attain their ultimate goal.

What the impeding conditions are will be presently stated. But is it not advisable to form a local administration in each district, sub-district and village, and to hold the inhabitants of such local areas responsible for good government? Similarly local government and provincial boards might be constituted for higher units. These local administrations should be subject to laws which have been framed in consultation with the people. Of course, the Government will have to re-

ernment will have to guide the deliberations over which they preside. The Balancer—to use the phrase for brevity's sake—must, however, beware of playing the parties off against each other, by siding with one one day, and favouring the other. If not, a sense of injury will be engendered and the country's best interests will suffer. Should there be any disposition to apprehend that the adoption of the system suggested will lead to the eventual overthrow of the Government we may at once say that this is impossible, so long as the officers of the Government continue to prove by their acts that they have the good of the country at heart, and so long as they effectively prevent the creation of dangerous conditions.

In our opinion the zamindar is an important link in the chain of administration, for he knows every bit of the ground and all matters that appertain to it. Further, he knows what his requirements are. There is no reason, therefore, why zamindars' associations or boards should not be started. These boards should be employed to improve the agricultural conditions in all their aspects so that the yield of land and of forests in the shape of raw materials could be collected in abundance and made readily available. This would help the manufacturing industries, and therefore the trade of the country.

Similarly, there may be started in each sub-district the traders' associations with the object of promoting commerce. The presidents of such associations or boards would be the same officers of the Government, and they would play the part of "Balancers" by restricting the boards' activities to profitable concerns and by composing differences. If they play this role successfully, not only will people continue to be happily engaged in their callings, but also they will not wish to concern themselves with the Home Rule and other

similar movements. The district officers should be enjoined to consult these boards in all matters and to encourage their making suggestions. These officers must create an atmosphere of confidence in which the people would unhesitatingly approach them regarding any disabilities under which they suffer. The officers would have to remove all legitimate complaints without importing into such rectification either their personal feelings or any false idea of prestige. At the same time they would have the authority to overrule anything that was undesirable. In such cases they would of course give their reasons for interdicting what they refuse to allow. But much more important than the explanation of reasons for the sake of rendering satisfaction is the tone adopted and the general attitude towards what is disallowed. The former must be conciliatory and not fierce and the latter that of friendly difference. If not all harmony of working must go by the board and the hydra of discontent must make its appearance.

The bodies contemplated should be invariably consulted in regard to all such matters as call for suppression. For example they may be usefully consulted as to how sedition should be prevented, how crime should be suppressed, how the police may be improved and how religious differences may be composed.

Military and political matters should, however, be the sole concern of the Government who would also retain the purse string in their own hands. When demands for money are put forward they must be carefully considered but the Government must decide how money is to be allocated under the several heads. Once the allocation has been made the associations and boards should be at liberty to spend the moneys as they like as long as they spend them usefully and profitably. Such expenditure would often involve the en-

gement of officers. In making these appointments, it should be endeavoured to give equal opportunities to all castes and creeds, consistently with the condition of certificated qualification. And it will be a good policy for any government to lay down the proportion in which the different castes shall be employed. Such an injunction would of course be consistent with the numerical strength of the various communities.

It is not suggested that there should be separate offices and agencies. What is intended is that if a decision has been arrived at in one of these bodies the existing agencies should give it effect in the ordinary course of prescribed procedure. The Government must of course retain complete discretion in the matter of increasing and decreasing the allotments.

It is the duty of communities whom Providence has called to rule over others to treat equally and impartially their own kith and kin and the people whom they govern. This equality of treatment must extend to official appointments also in order that the governed may have no occasion to feel that if responsible posts were held by some of their own, they would have received treatment that was at once helpful and advantageous. The subject races must not be allowed to think that if some of their own countrymen were highly placed in the official ladder, they only would get the opportunity to occupy minor official positions. In short, the Government should so perform their task that the subject people would not know that they were under a foreign master.

We think that it rests entirely with the officers of the Government to imbue with feelings of perfect trust the subject people and to make them thoroughly devoted to the Sovereign and his Government. So long as these officers are just and kind there can be no doubt that

who engender discontent amongst the governed cannot be looked upon as loyal servants of the Crown or of the Government.

The people of this country are essentially religious. Their pursuits are ultimately for the most part spiritual. Consequently, it is the clear duty of the Government to protect the various religions and to render every help in the performance of all the religious practices and ceremonies. Such protection should be rendered in an impartial manner and with an utter absence of bias or bigotry. An ample politeness should characterise their relations with all who belong to different persuasions. By this means it would be found extremely easy to gain a mastery over the peoples' hearts. The Indian States furnish so many illustrations of the effectiveness of this policy. This policy neither lowers the prestige nor compromises the position of any government. On the contrary, it heightens the esteem in which the government is held by the people. But what is far more important, this policy helps to eradicate the most common and acute differences. It is not inconsistent with any one's personal faith and saves such a deal of heart-burning and animosity. "If you live in Rome, do as the Romans do" is a well-known principle. Without such a principle the practical business of the world cannot go on, simply because you can't carry the people with you.

As an example of how this principle should be applied in practice, we would observe that there does not seem to be the slightest reason why on the occasion of such festivals as the "Id" and the "Dasehra" the Government officers concerned should not themselves organise a "procession," as is done in the Indian States. If this were done, people of all faiths and persuasions would join. Such a procession might start from a central point in the headquarters town and may end up after passing

through the principal streets, at the Town Hall, or some other place selected with an eye to suitability where a *shamiana* may have been pitched in advance. At this place the Durbaries may be asked to take seats and congratulated on behalf of the Sovereign. "*Itar Pan*" may then take place and the "Darbaries" may thereafter be enabled to mix freely with and congratulate each other. This done, the proceedings may terminate. The procession and the Darbar at the end would naturally have to be fixed for a convenient hour, so that the people who took part in them would have comfortably got through the observances enjoined upon them by their religion. We have no hesitation in saying that any objection to this plan can only be regarded as unreasonable. To import considerations of dignity and prestige into such a matter is to shut one's eyes to all reason and to court difficulties.

To turn to other matters, the question is also being debated, at the present time whether to treat the Indian States as a separate interest or as one with British India. We remember that there appeared in the "*Times of India*" two articles upon this question. One in the issue of the 20th December 1917 and the other on the 13th of June, 1918. Apropos of them we are of the opinion that the position as well as the Treaties of the States ought to be completely respected. But at the same time counsel should be sought with them in all matters relating to commerce, education, agriculture and all others of common concern. No less should they be consulted in respect of regulations to be framed and laws to be enacted which are likely to affect them. Such consultation can do no harm. On the contrary, the two interests would thus be harmonised. For example, take the Companies' Act. If this is framed under any other conditions the interests of general trade are bound to suffer. Further, if the representatives of

the States are allowed to join the representative bodies or assemblies in British India such joint deliberation cannot but ultimately have an improving effect upon the administrations of the States. Furthermore the States would thus become acquainted with the requirements of the people in general. As regards matters that are undergoing development it can be productive of nothing else but good for the people both of British India and the States to know what Laws or Rules of business retard all round progress. Such joint deliberation would of course be wise in itself unless all together approached questions in a friendly spirit that is to say with the object of affording all possible help to each other.

After all the States though separate are yet friendly allied and related administrations. It can possibly do no harm on the contrary it will surely do good to render them legitimate satisfaction and thus to carry them along. Their loyalty to the British Crown is undoubted their favourable disposition towards British Indian aspirations is equally unquestionable. It must therefore be held to be good policy to help on their progress by removing all hampering restriction and impeding reservations. Their support being admittedly an asset of the Empire there can be nothing more impolitic than to make them disaffected. Why not then ensure general harmony and smooth administration by enlisting their co-operation in the general progress of

Another suggestion is that Panchayat Boards should be appointed with enhanced powers with a view to save people from the ruinous expenditure of litigation. It may, however, be provided that if any party be dissatisfied with the award of a Panchayat Board, resort may be had to a regular Court of Law.

It also occurs to us to remark that delay, in the disposal of matters generally, also makes for defective and inefficient administration.

In any case a very pressing problem is to arrange that the capital of the Empire is all employed within the Empire and does not have to find employment in foreign countries. This, of course, is only possible if industries are pushed and trade and commerce are effectively enabled to expand. The sister countries within the Empire should freely help each other with capital. Experience has shown, however, that owing to delays in the approval of schemes, business men cannot afford to keep themselves or their capital idle, and, therefore, arrange to employ their wealth in foreign countries.

Again, the question of taxation in relation to the attraction or otherwise of capital must also be seriously considered. Heavy taxation has a tendency to scare away capital.

Yet another crucial matter is the maintenance of happy and sympathetic relations between the officers of Government and the leaders of the public associated with them in the transaction of public business. The treatment of the latter by the former should be such as to indicate identity of interest. It is a mistake to suffer these two classes of exponents to be ranged in opposite camps and to give rise to a condition of affairs in which one party is sworn to attack and the other pledged to defend. Such a state of things is productive of much

harm. Frankness combined with amiability is a wonderful talisman.

The following matters require the earnest consideration of administrators. Inattention to them often leads to discontent and unpopularity:—

(a) The revenue with its subsidiary department, land records, and the police are extremely important branches of administration. Their condition is, however, far from satisfactory. It is most important for the success of a government that the ryot should trust its officials, especially of the police department. To bring about such trust it is necessary that the superior officers should maintain close supervision over the acts of their subordinates. The effort should be to create the feeling in the mind of the ryot that the Government functionaries, specially of the police, are their well-wishers and mean to protect them from harm. It is of course the business of the police to bring the wrong-doers to justice, but they can do a great deal towards keeping the peaceful in proper temper.

(b) It is a platitude to say that the ryot is the goose that lays the golden egg. Even more, it is the supporter and the real benefactor of those engaged in the task of administration. This consideration entitles the ryots to the very best of treatment. But generally the ryots suffer the greatest hardships at the hands of district officers, the police and even the chakris. Consequently not to check the evil is to suffer a great blot to remain on the administration.

In this connection an appeal may also be made

to the legal profession. Its duty is to defend the innocent and also to see that the wrong doers do not escape punishment. Tyranny and injustice can be greatly minimised if this noble profession will adopt this creed. The criminal, the mischief maker, the oppressor and the liar who cause so much trouble should be made to suffer the maximum punishment prescribed, in order that there may be created a whole some respect for law. If the police, the courts and the legal profession combine in this humanitarian object it will greatly redound to their own credit and all administrations where such a righteous league exists will be highly and deservedly beloved of the people.

- (c) In conclusion we would say that the Government should endeavour, by all means possible to engage and seek counsel with people in the transaction of public business. It should also continue to afford proof of the fact that all those within the British Empire are one by having no diversity of aim and by the absence of any real conflict of interest, but above all by virtue of being the subjects of one common Sovereign. It should further ovince a disposition to work in with the people.

With the consciousness which we have of being prompted by none but the purest of motives in voicing these sentiments we hardly think it necessary to insert a word of apology at the end. Still we may express the hope that our observations will be read only as they are meant. We neither claim perfection nor divination. We perfectly realise our proneness to all ordinary human errors. All that we claim if we may repeat it, is to have been led into writing this piece by a

stern sense of duty to the country and an unexpressed desire to render service to the best of our lights. Our judgment may have gone astray and vital considerations may have escaped our limited ken. But we trust that our readers will requite our spirit of friendliness by construing us without any prejudice. Of course if an open mind is not brought to bear upon our reflections, they may well appear to be fraught with evil.

Let us see how far all this goes down with the people. One can only do one's best. The results must be in the lap of the Gods.

(Published in the 'East and West' of March 1919)

10. STRIKES IN INDIA.

A Suggested Remedy.

When one reads in the papers of "strikes" one cannot help thinking that all the efforts which have been made towards the spread of civilisation seem to have failed. In such circumstances one must say that it is distressing to see men of tactful and intelligent minds setting such undesirable examples, examples which are not only harmful but most dangerous to others. On this there can hardly be any difference of opinion.

From India's point of view it must be remembered that India is progressing. But if India takes to following such examples from a knowledge that in other countries people get by such actions what they want the result will be more harmful than good, as the principle is not a safe one. It is as clear as daylight that such attractive temptations may be yielded to but it is regrettable to note that no one will throw light on the cause of 'strikes'. Unfortunately the rest of the world, forgetting what led India to copy them in this respect, as she is copying so many things from all parts of the globe, will think that India is becoming untrustworthy and unfit to be considered as one of their own family.

Is it not then wise that those who are looked upon in this country as authorities and exponents of good morals, and have played a prominent part in the matter of progress and the spread of socialism in its better form, should avoid setting examples which are not merely harmful to the country but are particularly injurious to the young generation? I appeal to the generous hearts and minds of public men and would beg of them to consider whether such education is the edu-

cation needed at the moment. We must remember that little time has passed since we were feeling and undergoing the four years spell of risk and anxiety which, thank God, has just come to an end. The conqueror has won great credit and a glorious name. These must now be maintained. They were greatly due to union, good will, correct attitude and firmly based determination—virtues which are now becoming historical facts. They are worthy of consideration by those who have become conquerors by the grace of God. Is it in keeping with the dignity we have attained that the announcement of the Armistice should lead us, even before Peace is signed, to adopt such an attitude? It appears almost inhuman as one would have thought that the public would be at rest at least for twelve months from the time that the peace is sighted.

Who does not wish to improve his income, position and status? We all wish this and there are ways and ways—a good way, a harsh way and a bad way. Why should one not adopt the good way and drop from one's mind the other two? Really it is a great pity that we do not do so. It is natural to those who are the peace makers to look upon such actions as uncalled for. Is there no better way than "striking"? If not, I regret it again and again. I am sure there are better ways for an intelligent and model country whose movements are carefully watched. Our men of great experience and knowledge can find many other ways to get over their grievances and to save the country from the disgrace and disaster of "strikes". There is one way to improve on this and I suggest that it would be best to appoint a special Court to settle disputes on industrial matters before they ever grow into "strikes". Such a Court of Arbitrators could hear and decide when people had any sound point of view to urge.

Published in "The Times of India," dated 3-4-1919

II. THE PUNJAB MAIL.

The timing of this mail has been chopped and changed in the most light-hearted manner of recent years, and each change has been for the worse. The main factors which should govern the timing are quite simple. They are that the trains should leave Bombay with the minimum of inconvenience and loss of time to the business community, and that they should arrive at Delhi at as reasonable an hour as possible, but the time of arrival at Delhi is quite subordinate to that of the time of departure from Bombay. The present arrangements are nicely calculated to secure the maximum of inconvenience and the minimum of advantage. The normal timing of the G I P mail, for the present arrangements are only transitory, is to leave Bombay at two o'clock and to arrive in Delhi at 9 p.m. Now a two o'clock mail from Bombay is a nuisance. It cuts right into a busy day and it involves leaving Victoria Terminus at the hottest hour of the day. Our correspondent suggests that it should leave Victoria Terminus at eight a.m. and reach Delhi at six p.m. The mail from Simla to Bombay is ordinarily still more inconvenient. Either the passenger must leave Simla by the rail motor and kick his heels at Kalka station for nearly six hours, or else come down by the Simla-Kalka Railway, a most wretched and tedious journey. In either case he reaches Bombay—or ought to reach Bombay—at three in the afternoon, which wastes the whole of that day. The alternative proposed is to leave Kalka at 6.50 and to reach Victoria Terminus at eleven a.m. Then there is the Northern Express by the B B & C I Railway. Any commonsense adjustment of

two mail services to a centre of the importance of Delhi would provide a considerable gap between the departure of the mails, for instance, if one mail went in the morning the other would start in the evening. We now have the absurdity of the two mails leaving within two hours of each other, and both at an inconvenient and wasteful hour. If the G I P mail leaves in the morning then the B B & C I mail ought to leave in the evening, say somewhere about six or seven o'clock which would permit of a full day's work being done in Bombay before starting. The subject is much too important to be settled by the *obiter dictum* of the Railway authorities for the public are vitally concerned. We suggest, therefore that steps be taken to ascertain the public wishes in this respect and then to fix timings which will be adhered to. In Europe the principal mail trains run for years on the same timings, without material disturbance. What is possible there, with a variety of interests to consider, ought to be much easier in India where the State either owns or has a controlling interest in the principal railways. Let us have the issue fairly threshed out and a definite policy laid down which will last for years.

(Published in "The Times of India" dated 3-1-1919)

12. THE PRESENT UNREST.

Thoughtful Reflections.

The present world conditions have, no doubt, given food for thought to many. Perfection there never was and probably never can be, and it is impossible to imagine a state of society where everything is to the satisfaction of all. This is not possible even in a small household, let alone the wide, wide world.

But the present unrest is more widely spread, and, perhaps, deeper than any yet known to history. All this cannot but retard progress. The labouring classes are bent on strikes and do not seem to reflect that unless production is increased there cannot be any permanent increase in wages. Increased cost of production must make the cost of living higher and higher, and intensify more and more the evils from which the world is now suffering. They have already reduced the hours of work and the cry for more wages and less work is still insistent. There is intense class distrust and class antagonism. Cannot something be devised to make people see things in their true perspective? Of what good will be the League of Nations if individual countries become like houses divided against themselves?

THE EXAMPLE OF AFGHANISTAN.

Looking nearer home one is struck with wonder and surprise. One is simply aghast at the attitude adopted by Afghanistan. No reliable news is to hand of the circumstances attending the tragic death of the late Amir, nor is it clear why such treatment was meted out to such a good man as Amir Habibullah. Those

who knew him could never imagine such an end as possible. The real condition of the country is generally unknown to outside people, but one can gather from the newspapers that the Afghans are not in a chastened mood of repentance. However, a well-wisher of theirs cannot help but ask them to take long views and see whither their recent conduct must lead them. So far as one could judge from outside, there was nothing to make the country embark on such a mad enterprise. They should have strained every nerve to maintain peace and to obviate causes leading to its disturbance, devoting their attention to the introduction of such reforms as would lead to the progress of their country. The example of Japan and of other countries should have been a great stimulus to them. Afghanistan does not seem to have advanced much during the last sixty years. It is the first duty of its Ruler, if he be guided by wisdom and the desire for the good of his people, to banish barbarism from the country, and to spread knowledge and the arts of civilization which would bring the flowers of prosperity as in a well tended garden. It is a matter for sorrow that Afghanistan should set the evil example of murdering a good and wise Ruler like the late Amir. The Afghans should not lose sight of the fate that has befallen Turkey and they will be wise to avoid pitfalls.

PROGRESS AND HOME RULE

Looking at India, a strange spectacle meets the vision. People have forgotten what steady "Progress" is and they are all shouting "Home Rule." 'Home Rule,' and I need not point out that "Progress" and "Home Rule" are not necessarily synonymous. In fact it is not difficult to imagine conditions where 'Home Rule' may mean the opposite of "Progress." My appeal to the people of the country is maintain conditions

that make for "Progress," prevent the dislocation of business in general, and, whatever be your rights, try to preserve them with tact and moderation. Internal quarrels and disputes will cause disturbances, which in their train will bring poverty and misery. That will not only retard progress, but it will take a long time even to restore existing conditions

One finds with despair that a majority of people listen to evil counsels much more readily than to advice which is really for their good. The newspapers also have a great opportunity and a correspondingly great duty laid upon them to lead people on to the right path by abstaining from publishing anything that may cause excitement or disturbances. Not long ago *The Times of India* published an article which contained a paragraph to the effect that great responsibility lay upon the newspapers for maintenance of law and order in the country, and that their own (newspapers') prosperity depended upon the prosperity of the country. It is, therefore, incumbent upon the newspapers in their own interests to try to create healthy public opinion and curb evil tendencies. Otherwise there is great danger of constant disturbances and of attendant evils of poverty and misery in the country.

DUTY OF GOVERNMENT AND LEADERS.

The government, it matters not what government it is, should so act towards the people that the people may regard the government as their "Ma Bap" (Mother and Father). This is a common and very expressive phrase in India denoting that very close and intimate relationship, which makes the parents bestow every care and affection upon their offspring.

Government should be careful not to take the lead in any matter that may create an unfavourable impression upon the minds of the people. It is an axio-

matic truth that the foundations of that government are well and truly laid which has the whole-hearted support of the people and where the obedience of the people is willing and not due to any fear caused by pressure or force. These are broad and obvious principles, yet it is not easy to understand why these are overlooked and the state of the country is allowed to go from bad to worse.

The public leaders should also understand that greater responsibility is theirs to maintain the progress of the country. They should adopt such a policy as would root out from the minds of the people all thoughts of disputes and disturbances without making them lose sight of the objective. The objective should be that the Emperor and his Government should be maintained intact and if, on occasion, there be a slip on the part of the Government, representation should be made with such tact, moderation and foresight that the error may be happily rectified. If this course of conduct is not followed I am afraid evils will increase day by day and that will bring no good to the country. Ministers of States should also not forget that great responsibility lies upon them to act with great foresight, judgment, tact and caution and they should not act thoughtlessly or lightly. Anything done under the stress of excitement or passion is sure to lead to disaster because passion obscures vision and clouds the intellect.

A FINAL APPEAL

Therefore, O brethren whether of Afghanistan or of India or of any other country, I appeal to you all in whatever you do ponder well and deeply before launching upon any course of action and avoid the doing of things that may cause widespread loss of life things by which women and children lose their support and protection and families and countries may be run-

ed. You should never forget God and to pray to Him in all humility that He may give us goodness, wisdom and strength to maintain peace and order and to root out evils that cause dissatisfaction and disturbances

(Published in "The Times of India," dated 22-8-1919)

13. MUSINGS OF A WANDERER.

Luckily for society and the individual there are occasions, positions and situations which in their own place are conducive to concentrated thought. I find that the train journey is one of these. The other day, while speeding to my destination, with such speed as the G. I. P. express could make, my thoughts sped also and they dwelt on the present condition of affairs in particular regard to the dearth of food and the general unrest and discontent, which characterise the present times. That this state of affairs should arise after the termination of the gigantic war from which the British Empire including India has emerged triumphant is, if not strange, certainly very deplorable.

Theorists always have an easy explanation of every thing, and the explanation one hears at the present day from the mouth of every one who pretends to probe causes and to understand their results, is that the upheaval, which we are now witnessing, is entirely economic. The explanation may be sufficient, but it is too widely worded to be definite. The question is even though economic, what is the principal and the exact cause? In other words, what is the essential factor in the economic situation, which is directly and largely responsible for the poor people specially resorting to ways to which they in this country have never been accustomed.

I venture to suggest that the grain merchants who deal directly with the poor workmen for purposes of the sale and barter of food grains are responsible for

occasioning the present discontent. They seem, however, to be following a very short sighted policy. I feel no hesitation in saying that the profits of the merchants generally, and of these in particular depend upon the contentment of the ryots. If the former endeavour to preserve the latter, larger business will come their way and therefore, they may expect larger profits and greater prosperity for themselves.

I cannot claim sufficiently wide experience of the necessary kind to speak with any weight of authority much less to be in a position to lay down the law on the point—and at the best of times to dogmatise is not in my line—so I apologise beforehand for the suggestion and the appeal I am going to make.

I appeal at once to the generous heart of the Government and to all our God fearing merchants, specially the grain dealers to take the long view and to make vivid sympathy towards the poor the basis and the predominant note of their policy and of their dealings with the mass of the people. This line of action alone will pay in the long run for to day's profit and to morrow's loss cannot be contemplated as either a very happy state or prospect. That way lies not only the possibility of a greater loss in the end but the probability of disaster.

Business acumen and commercial shrewdness if they can enable anything should enable correct forecast and the striking of balance. At the same time there is no use in hiding the fact that to strike a balance somebody's interests have to be sacrificed and from another point of view somebody's displeasure has to be incurred.

To come to my point at once, I think the various Governments in this country and the trade should combine make up their minds and decide to fix the mini

imum rates of the various commodities somewhat as follows —

Ghee	per	rupee	from	1	to	1½	seers
Gram	"	"	"	13	"	14	"
Wheat	"	"	"	11	"	12	"
Gwar	"	"	"	18	"	20	"
Bajra	"	"	"	16	"	18	"
Makka	"	"	"	22	"	25	"
Oil	"	"	"	2	"	2½	"
Jaggery (Gud)	"	"	"	7	"	8	"
Fuel wood	"	"	"	2	"	3	maunds

I quite expect the people to laugh at my suggestion and to regard it as ludicrous, absurd, impracticable and every thing else, which can be expressed by a condemnatory word in the English language; but I am prepared to face public ridicule. The point I wish to make is that the welfare of the body politic and the weal of any human society depends primarily upon the nourishment of the physical system and the maintenance of the power of work. If the nourishment is not sufficient and therefore, the power and consequently the will to work contentedly and profitably is sapped only misery can result from which, in the end, even the better fed and the long pursed cannot escape. This is a point which is well worth focusing and fixing in the public attention, as I fear that if it should be lost sight of, the consequences may be terrible.

The self-constituted or selected leaders of the Labour Association hardly seem to approach their task from this point of view. It is a misfortune of our country that we borrow not only readily but bodily from foreign countries the worst and not the best. I do not know how it is, but we seem extremely prone, always extremely predisposed to being permeated with the foreign spirit. The dangerous formula say the

popular thing, get majority on your side and with this backing demand what is most fashionable at the moment, and you can be sure of consideration and respect on one hand and the concession of your demand by the most unyielding government on the other. But may I venture to suggest that the happy society is the one which coheres and the safest government the one whose subjects are bound to it with feelings of loyalty and fidelity. Pressure, which does not make for public happiness is never justified of its result. It is risky, it is dangerous, it has the possibility of proving disastrous.

In our present distraction when the human mind seems disgruntled and distraught, we cannot do better than turn our thoughts upon the Eternal Source of Wisdom and the Everlasting Fountain of Peace. In this busy age when we are for ever hustling, when we are perpetually busy planning towards what we consider to be the final goal, we think too little and as for prayer, we have no time for it. I, therefore, say Oh God All Wise, Almighty, save us from ourselves and from the consequences of our blindness, for we know not what we do. Thou art the supreme Mind. Thou controllest all human minds. Oh Tender and Merciful, guide our steps aright and show us the way. Help us Oh Lord to work unitedly on one platform, to work for the good of thy children, to work so that we may help the poor and save the rich from disaster.

14. EXCESS VERSUS MODERATION.

A Dialogue Between Two Boon Companions

(Rendered and adapted from the original)

FIRE-EATER—Greetings—May the Peace of God descend upon you

SLOW-COACH—Halloa! I reciprocate your blessings. Hope you are well What an age it is since we met. Why friend! What is the matter? We never seem to meet and you don't appear to bother about us poor folk! Why are we estranged?

But never mind let us have a rare old buck I'll just launch forth—Tell me, why do we see nothing but topsy-turvydom all round us in the World now-a-days?

Good Lord! If things continue very much in this way, then what will happen? "Nunc dimittis"! "Thy Kingdom come," I presume!

But seriously have you thought over the matter from this point of view? Wherever you turn, you find nothing but confusion worse confounded We seem to have fallen upon strangely evil days—for on all sides we hear nothing but the counsels of perfection One chap says—"Strike"—another says 'boycott' Some preach "Hartal," while others concentrate on the "Khilafat question" In the midst of all this the women-folk of the country are working out grand plans for themselves, borrowing ideas without examination as the ground work of their schemes To crown all prices in this country seem to have developed a spirit of rivalry with the American 'Sky-Scrapers'—Heaven knows what is to come next

But, please God, even these the clouds will disperse, leaving sunshine behind Life is never the same and I

fancy in all ages sorrow and happiness have alternated. So let us pray.—Oh, Merciful God, Creator and Protector of the Universe have mercy on thy Creatures. Whether good, after Thy heart, or full of evil—we are Thine and owe our existence to Thee. Keep us from evil and lead our steps on the path of righteousness. Oh God, Almighty—it is the truth and nothing but the truth that not a single leaf on the branch of a tree can move except in obedience to the laws ordained by Thee.

Old friend! it breaks my heart to see that in these days of civilisation and advancement, man is rather intent on ignoring God and discarding all moral responsibility—Is not the exhortation "Live for others" as full of wisdom to-day as ever it was? Then why don't we help each other instead of cutting each other's throats.

Why don't we apply ourselves to the prosperity of the country and work for Peace and all its blessings! Mark my words—Egotism which is at the bottom of all selfishness and all strife will yet sound the death-knell of civilised society.

But let us take one thing at a time I am afraid I am monopolising the conversation—which has so far been very one-sided, but you are the wise one and I seek enlightenment—what is this bogey of "Khilafat"?

What are the true mainsprings of the deep sympathy which is being professed? Can you give me any instances of sympathy felt for us in distant countries, the memory of which imposes upon us the moral obligation to sympathise so actively now? I, for one, don't remember any talk even until only a few years ago as regards any such obligation under which we had been placed. Bearing in mind the grateful nature of our countrymen, it is hard to believe that if there had been any call on our gratitude it wouldn't have rung through the length and breadth of the country. My knowledge of history may be defective, but so far as I know it, I

can't remember any occasion on which the people of other countries showed such marked sympathy with us that in return we are now obliged as moral beings to reciprocate.

If I am right in my facts, then why this turmoil? If the fuss we are making is based upon expediency, then our tactics are unquestionably wrong. Is it not possible to eschew aggressiveness and adopt methods that would be an example to the world— in other words can't we gain our ends without throwing mud and getting bespattered ourselves?

I grant that the pursuit of such a course presupposes the exercise, in the highest degree, of the virtues of forbearance and unity, not to say of knowledge and impartiality. And further, the virtues must be supported by honesty of purpose, truthfulness of speech and above all by God-fearingness. We may shut our eyes to it, but it is an eternal truth that these virtues alone lead to eventual success—and I think I may say that even the happenings of recent times have vindicated this truth. Of course it is a question of time. You know the old, old children's story of the tortoise and the hare

To adapt one of our own proverbs —“It is better to eat bread that is cold than to eat that which is too hot.”

• With my nineteenth century outlook on life, what I am bothered about is that if the present conditions as to aims and methods continue the consequences to the country may be very grave indeed. I want to feel assured that there is intelligent and practicable thought behind the course that is being pursued. I for one feel that we are perilously near disaster.

Have you ever considered that the weaker always goes to the wall, and further that strife and controversy always react upon the poor, and the rebound is never over the heads of those who have egged them on to action which they never understood. Why should the ignorant poor be dragged into your political or social battles?

brethren It is up to you to listen to and ponder or to reject it all with scorn One thing is clear that the poor go to the wall Show me a case in which the "Big Guns" have ever suffered My only regret is that even those whom a Wise Providence has called to give us Peace and Contentment have so far done nothing to enable the people to understand the real facts of the various cases—and now they are coloured and distorted and embroidered to mislead the public

Take the question of prices They have attained a level which has given rise to a dismal outlook As a sign of the times, I recall the fact that the other day some one pleaded through the public Press with the trading world for consideration, but that pleading seems to have gone for nothing probably because the suggestion put forward was summarily dismissed as quixotic So much might be said for the Government that it is awkward for them to interfere in matters of this nature which are best settled by invoking the public spirit of the people who are directly concerned with and control these affairs In that view, would it not be better if the public men got together and evolved some way out of the difficulty in a spirit of compromise and humanity? Supposing we formed a representative body which would command respectful hearing and advise as to the lines on which the poor can be saved from starvation, consistently with leaving a fair margin of profit to the trade and ensuring the prosperity of the country It is true that such a *via media* will make excessive profits being earned by traders and merchants impossible, but lower returns thus secured—there is no question of loss—can be surely made up by increased enterprise and a wider field of business, which is the real desideratum Let it not be forgotten that the health of the labourer is the greatest economic asset, for on it ultimately depends the earning capacity of the big capitalist

I plead for going slow as regards the various questions that are being taken up all of a heap—"Hasten Slowly"—precipitous haste is disastrous.

An essential factor in our progress is the working shoulder to shoulder of East and West, resulting from genuine mutual good will and an earnest desire on either side to help and co operate with the other. We should clearly realise our dependance upon the West as regards invention and execution, our knowledge of industrial chemistry, the engineering sciences and the healing arts, three of the most important fields of present human activity for that matter all knowledge of any practical utility is derived by us from the West, and we are dependant upon it for being kept *au fait* with the advances made in this direction. Not only that, but we have developed such a penchant for things Western that they have become indispensable to our daily life. As against this, we find an entire absence of confidence, amongst ourselves, in our countrymen who know the practice of these various arts and sciences. What a predicament to be in?

Of course the reply to my pleading for working hand in hand with the West would be that the nations of that quarter of the globe are so intoxicated with power that there can be no hope of fair play at their hands. Granted, but doesn't the remedy for this lie in bringing about friendly intercourse leading to a proper understanding rather than in the Roland for an Oliver policy. Remember that the chances of success must remain remote as long as a thorough understanding is not established. I am sure many can speak from personal experience as regards the charm and solvent effect of happy social relations. I grant that as to this matter fearful shortsightedness characterises the attitude of both sides, but then we are in the position of those who have concessions to obtain. This view may be accepted or not, but

the fact remains that there is no getting on without a correct understanding. Therefore, in the conditions that are, the best policy would seem to be to gain the good will of those with whom we have been yoked to pull together. Conceit will not pay, no, nor insolence either. I think it is accepted deduction of social philosophy that "Pride goeth before destruction." He would be a bold man who would assert that he is entirely free from defects. Human nature was not intended to be perfect in all details—all races, all communities, all individuals have their defects. So we, for our part must take large views and preserve human attitude—also let us make up our minds that we shall come out victorious only if we carry on the fight with the weapons of honesty and toleration. Those who are moved by false pride and who set a great store by mere cleverness are bound in the long run to be worsted in the struggle. Time must fight on our side and must have our patience as his ally.

The history of the world is the history of humbled pride. The wonder only is that even apparent dangers do not suffice to keep people from going headlong to ruin when they, by different tactics, might easily become public benefactors. Who knows, but there may be a wise ordainment of Providence behind it all. Just consider what a riot of irrationality there is all around us. The world seems to have gone crazy and a particular "Stunt" is the order of the day. The World all round presents an amazing spectacle—instead of being a sight for the Gods it is enough to make the angels weep. It all reminds one so forcibly of the words of Hafiz who when bewailing the cycle of the Moon said

اس چه شورشست که در دور قمر می بدم

هم آفتاب بر آرمش و شب می بدم

رنج رحمت نه برادر نه برادر داد
 بدیج شفقت نه پدر را نه پسر می بینم
 دختران را همه جنگ است و جدل نامادر
 پسران را همه نه خواه پدر می بینم
 اسپ تازی سده مسروح نه بر روی پالان
 طوق زرین همه در گردن حر می بینم
 ابلهان را همه شربت رگلاب و نقد است
 قوت دانا همه از خون حاکم می بینم
 پند حافظ بشو خواهر بر روی کی کی
 رانکه اس پند نه از در و گهر می بینم

What is this riot that I see in the cycle of the Moon The whole universe seems to be filled with tumult and confusion

Brothers have no mercy on each other nor has the father any soft feeling for his son

The daughters are eternally at war with their mothers, and sons actually wish their father's ill

The thorough bred horse is sorebacked under a mule load while the necklace of gold goes to adorn the asinine neck

The foolhardy's beverage is the syrup of rose and candy while the lot of the man of wisdom is to subsist upon his own heart's blood

Listen to Hafiz's advice, Oh thou respectable one go do good in the World for this advice is better than all the pearls and precious stones

Oh Lord of the Universe! forgive us our transgressions, listen to our wail as the wail of Thy helpless ones in agony

Oh Loving Father! guide our steps aright and give us the two highest boons Peace and Contentment.

15. THE KHILAFAT.

A Few Questions.

It would be very helpful indeed if some one in the know would take the trouble publicly to state what is really behind the "Khilafat Movement," that is explain the ultimate object which is desired to be attained by the expression of righteous indignation of the treatment of Turkey as decided upon by the Great Allies

Any person who appeals to the intelligentsia of a country, or for that matter to the masses through the media of the public press and the public platform, is straightway disqualified for his task and not entitled to a hearing if he attempts to discredit a public movement by imputing motives to its leaders, ridicules it as futile, or suggests the existence of a sinister design behind a profession of a principled agitation

For my part I gladly and whole-heartedly accept the Khilafat controversy as a perfectly legitimate subject of public comment, inspired by a sense of public morality and a genuine desire to see it maintained at its modern high standard. I do not therefore, characterize the zeal manifested in regard to the fortunes of Turkey as affected or irresponsible. But what I do most earnestly desire is to comprehend the psychology of the protagonists and to understand how they reconcile their attitude with the logic of facts

As far as I have been able to make out the Turkish question is alleged to possess for the Mahomedans of India a religious aspect and for the people of India

generally an ethical one. Plainly put, the Sultan of Turkey must remain the Khalifa or Islam is vanquished, and Turkey territorially must remain as she was before she entered the war, or the standard of international morality which was raised amidst the din of battle must be half-masted for the plighted word of Great Britain has been blushlessly eaten. This I take to be the position of the Khilafat movement leaders, a summary of their arguments and the gravamen of their indictment.

But let us examine the position dispassionately—in the light of history—in the light of facts—no less than from the point of feasibility and the interest of all parties concerned, applying to our examination as we go along the test of doctrines which find most favour in the present time.

So far as regards the Khilafat continuing to inhere in the Sultan of Turkey, the Government of Great Britain has made it quite clear that it has no concern with the question who is to be the Khalifa and that it is entirely a question for the Moslem world to decide. In view of this very explicit declaration, it hardly appears to be necessary to go into the claims of the Sultan to the high office of Khalifa—although it might be remarked in passing that the researches of Indian historians, no less than the recent attitude of Afghanistan, to which country the Moslems of India now wish to repair in increasing numbers, in regard to the matter would appear to contradict the claims put forward both in respect of the Sultan's title and in respect of the Khalifa, whoever he may be, being master of sufficiently extensive territory and owner of a large enough measure of temporal power to sustain his spiritual stewardship.

As for the complaint of broken pledge, Mr Edmund Candler's open letter to Mr. Gandhi, one must own for

the sale of honest thinking, makes very convincing reading indeed

I think there are people who complain that *vis à-vis*, the Armenian, the Turk is being condemned unheard. But is the partitioning of Turkey, which is complained of, entirely the result of the biased sympathy of Christian peoples with the Armenian?

Then again, how is it that the Mahomedan blood and in sympathy with it, the blood of Hindu fair playing political leaders, was not up on the several occasions when Turkey was mulcted of its Provinces? I extract the following from a writer of authority who represented a Neutral Power at the time the occurrences he narrates took place—a Power which even to day is not at one with the British Government over the Turkish question —

‘By 1913 many changes had taken place. Austria had annexed two Turkish Provinces, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Italy had wrenched away Tripoli, Turkey had fought two wars with the Balkan States and had lost all her territories in Europe, except Constantinople and a small hinterland.”

But a small band of energetic zealots who would appear to have been prompted more by a spirit of admirable enterprise than by sentiments of purely religious friendship and that only during the time of the Balkan affair, who went on a mission to Turkey, no occasion can be recalled on which either such identity of interests between India and Turkey was manifested as now or when apprehension as to the future fate of Turkey absolutely forced Indians precipitately to cry off allegiance to the Government of Great Britain to dare anything and to risk all.

Per contra, it might be asked especially of students of history, when, in the palmiest days of the Ottoman Empire the interests of their co-religionists in India

or of those who subsisted alongside of them in this country, ever gave a moment's trouble to the Mahomedan Turk of that Europeo-Asiatic Power? Truly the war has witnessed many changes, but none more striking than the springing up of feelings which were unknown so short a time as ten years ago!

What then, I ask again, in all humility and all earnestness, is there really behind the "Khilafat Movement"? And why does it need such adventitious aids and such shadowy, if not shady, props to sustain itself? Is the extramural patriotism really such a casuistic obligation that the origin of charity must be completely forgotten?

If there are privileges to acquire, if there are legitimate grievances that need redress, or to put it less deferentially and euphemistically, if there are rights that must be wrested—why not focus them, state them baldly and unemotionally so as to give the less-informed an opportunity of considering them? There would thus be secured a larger following and an unanimity of view which is so important in political life. If the leading thinkers of the country would only get together, frame a programme of steady and sober ventilation of hardships and disabilities, instead of devising new modes for the expression of resentment such as the renunciation of titles which even Mr Gandhi has deprecated, there might be some chance of harmony—the condition precedent of all sociological, economic and political progress

(Published in 'The Times of India,' dated 7 6 1920)

16. THE STATE OF INDIA.

Pacific Counsels.

When the Philosopher Prince exclaimed "There is something rotten in the state of Denmark," he delivered himself, we may say, of a well-weighed utterance respecting India in the year of grace 1920 A.D.¹ Making every allowance for the factors and forces that have come into play and for their reaction and interaction, the present condition of affairs still remains something of a mystery, a something unintelligible, incomprehensible, unfathomable—and as for a remedy that will prove adequate—Ah! well—there is a forlorn hope!

If the brains of the country do not even now employ their far-sighted statesmanship in the service of the country to moderate the pace, so characteristic of riding for a fall, who can avert the catastrophe—the mangled heap at the bottom of the precipice—before it is too late?

Unrest, clamour, fufumation, uproar, alternating with menaces and denunciation, eventuating now and again in actions which either dislocate the even tenor of economic life or bid fair to disorganize society and produce chaos; to say that this is the order of the day is hardly to exaggerate the fact. Sad beyond words is the predicament we are in. And yet it would seem as if it were seriously believed that the height of wisdom varied inversely with calm deliberation and the panacea of all trouble lay in *paralysing the existing politi-*

Indiscriminate importation of exotics, slavish imitation, aping what else is it? What milder judgment can be passed upon the methods that find favour?—methods that are calculated to alter our social structure hopelessly beyond recognition. Nobody seems to have any use for the sage observation that if borrow we must from foreign countries, we should only borrow that which is best in them, that which is of proved worth, that which will suit and be assimilated rather than that which being truly foreign matter will course like a toxin in the veins generate disease and cause the decay of the body politic.

Anyhow, before they advocate the adoption of methods which are entirely foreign to our conception of the State, is it not reasonable to expect that our public speakers will acquaint the public with the pros and cons of each question, state both sides of each case, or as the expression goes, exhibit both sides of the shield—always drawing a faithful picture with proper light and shade. One-sided versions are proverbially dangerous, and nothing is more conducive to misleading the public than partisan utterances and un-lateral writings. Besides, common honesty demands fair representation of every case and surely the claims of honesty must take precedence over those of clever tactics.

NO WAY OUT?

Again, really and truly, is there no alternative to threats and menaces. Is there no way out of the difficulties that there may be, except along the path of coercion? If the belief is that in politics force must be the first and the last resort I wonder if that is really a case of taking a leaf out of Britain's book? But at the cost of repetition, I would say that object imitation of foreign methods is an unsound doctrine of public conduct. "Many countries, many customs" is an eastern proverb—and the customs are determined by differences of climate, temperament and social organization.

It is perfectly true that no government should adopt measures which are likely to lead to evil consequences, nor should it court unnecessary unpopularity and thus teach the people to agitate and nurse a sense of grievance. Differently put, it behoves every government to take stock of the people's progress in education (the more particularly in the case of a nation which has possessed an ancient civilisation, even though its training on modern lines may have taken place gradually within recent years) and to concede to them the management of their own affairs in a measure proportional to their capacity in this respect. But such transference of authority should always be a free and voluntary gift prompted by the government's own recognition of capacity and not a grudging concession to irresistible pressure. Nothing so conduces to deep attachment and genuine loyalty as the anticipation of legitimate demands and their graceful acceptance as the reward of laudable ambition, in the process of development.

Unfortunately, however the moral deducible from recent happenings is that not an inch of ground shall be yielded until to speak metaphorically, it has been fought for and won. Such an attitude can scarcely be called very wise tactics. The wiser course obviously is to entrust people with responsibilities according to their intelligence and capacity—the more so as people, at the present moment seem to be very keen on shouldering responsibility.

Surely, it is as essentially human to feel genuinely grateful for unexpected trust, as for unexpected favours, and equally true it is that nothing conduces more to intensify loyalty than does deep and sincere gratitude. This would appear to be the best line for the Government to take in the present conditions of this country. The contrary policy, *viz.*, that of making people prove their capacity for united clamour, threatening demon-

trations, solid front and opposition in serried ranks, can only tend to alienate affection and wean attachment.

It is to be feared that the harm done does not stop there. for unlawful acts are but a step removed from extinguished devotion and the menace which is bred of despair. It is indeed amazing that such simple facts of mass psychology should escape the calculated estimates of the powers that be.

OFFICIALS AND THE FUTURE.

The official-class as a whole—European and Indian alike—seem to have adopted the strangest principles of conduct, the creed of the former seems to be that any one showing a marked leaning towards India's aspirations is to be promptly tabooed, so much so that even if one of themselves commits the sin, he is doomed to ostracism, the distinguished feature of the latter is that they allow personal considerations to override all others. Between them, this false conception of prestige and this disregard of what is just may lead to the most disastrous results, even possibly to a reversion to that unsettled state of affairs which obtained before the enterprise and genius of Britain began to build up the present fabric of the Indian Empire.

There is also a tendency amongst the officials to think that the future can take care of itself, so far as their time is concerned, they must try and get through anyhow, and the remedy they generally apply to situations that arise is mainly repressive and therefore undesirable. But it seems to be forgotten that this is extremely unkind not to say short-sighted, and by no means the true Imperial attitude, in that they accumulate a legacy in the shape of disaffection for their successors which no conscientious person should leave. Again, it seems to be forgotten that the Government of the country and therefore, the officials as a class have the

unfailing support of a section of people who have to live here for ever—who are not birds of passage, there to-day and gone to-morrow, and whose interests stand to be jeopardised, because of their support, in consequence of the disregard of public sentiment on narrow and unstatesmanlike considerations.

The observation may be ventured that a close adherence to the Western principles of governance will not avail to keep this country contented—other principles and different methods are needed to rule over this continent. In a nutshell, the amulet is a compound of sympathy, considerateness, civility and real affection. Honours and decorations are possibly useful weapons to employ in fighting recalcitrancy but they cannot help as effectively as other concrete tokens of good will or esteem, however insignificant. To exemplify in terms of local customs, the present of a few beetle leaves (*do pan ki patty*) or the gift of a memento or keepsake, so long as they were prompted by a spirit of social bonhomie or real camaraderie would be more highly appreciated than all formal awards and recognitions.

LOCAL CUSTOMS

What goes even further is the exhibition of real interest in local customs and ceremonies, provided it is essentially friendly and not begotten of inquisitive curiosity. The exhibition of interest assumes practice of active participation in social intercourse along lines of indigenous usage. "If you live in Rome do as the Romans do" is a proposition which has enjoyed unquestioned acceptance for many centuries. No unity of aim, no real close ties, not even unqualified trust and perfect confidence can be expected without intimate cordial social relations. These are the conditions precedent of all accord and harmony.

To take the most trifling of examples, what a marvellous change would come over the reciprocal relations of the two races and over the social out-look of the country as a whole, if the narrow views of the present yielded place to broader conceptions, on the part of the European, in the matter of sitting on the floor or taking off shoes when the occasion demanded it? To regard such acts of social amity as *infra dig*, or calculated to lower the prestige of the ruling class, is the greatest of many great blunders that are daily perpetrated. Such adoption of the country's ways and practices does not appear to present any difficulty in Egypt or in Turkey. The pity of it all is that this visible invidiousness leads irresistibly to the conclusion that it is self-interest which is the guiding principle and the determining factor in all such matters. What hope can there be, in such circumstances, of the growth of feeling of identical interests?

It has even been argued that concessions in the social line might easily encroach upon one's religious beliefs. The contention is too ludicrous to need refutation. For religion and conformity with purely social institutions of a country are as poles asunder. If anything the wide toleration and the human sympathy and consideration, from which alone can spring social accommodation, possess some religious merit and much ethical virtue. Unthinking objection and indiscriminate prejudice can go no further. The result is sometimes seen in strangely vague *ipse dixit* and perfectly preposterous, *obiter dicta*. I ample, an officer once remarked that what was not entirely consistent with European notions of propriety was a thing frankly impossible of adoption in deference to local sentiment.

It all comes to this that compelling compliance by resort to coercion is a dangerous game to play with a whole nation. It is like sitting over a volcano, you

never know when there may come an eruption and the blaze is not within human power to restrain. Is it wise or expedient? Is it not feasible and practicable to secure people's support and following by gaining their good-will?

It is worth while pondering over the question "Which government is more firmly established, that which is broad—based upon people's affections, or that which rests upon the broken reed of people's helplessness and their temporary impotence?"

II

The writer's sole objetet in inditing this rigmarole is to plead for the adoption of a line of action which will secure the hearty approval of the people of this country—nay, fill them with enthusiasm and make them loud in the praises of their Government.

It is trusted that what is being said will not be so far misinterpreted as to be taken for an attack upon our well-meaning Government, on the contrary, the seeming criticism and this apparent denunciation are merely pleas for an immediate change of policy.

Theories of an older day have had their run. They need to be revised in the light of changed conditions. Other times, other methods, that is the key-note of the present situation.

It is quite recognised that policies of Governments cannot undergo sudden changes, nor is this expected, but after all what is really wanted is good treatment and unflinching justice. These are already parts of the Government's policy and articles of their creed, and as neither the doing of practical justice, nor the giving of kind treatment involve any constitutional change, nor a repeal or modification of any existing laws, it is difficult to think why these principles are not adopted in actual practice.

unaware of our own shortcomings. Who is to point out our faults to us, with any chance of being believed?

If we will only make fair play our motto, we should soon realise that we ourselves are largely responsible for many of the Englishman's faults. Have we not spoilt him in the past by our inveterateness, by want of back bone and cringing? In another sphere, for gaining a temporary personal advantage, by sacrificing higher interests? Both our pliability and our bargaining have produced their counter-parts, the Englishman's superciliousness and his policy of *divide et impera*. Let history speak. And now, because the Prime Minister said that as a consequence of the war the sort of awakening which previously used to take centuries to come, now occurs in weeks, we want the Englishman to change his century-old habits in a trice. It is only a quarter of a century since the change which has culminated in the present plunso dawned over the political life of India and the method of respectful representation gave place to those of agitation and demonstration. Let us bethink ourselves of the simple laws which govern official psychology or even race psychology and if we will but honestly and patiently analyse, we would be bound to admit that on the whole, the Englishman, and particularly the bureaucrat, is endeavouring to adapt himself to the altered conditions.

To the Englishman we merely address the question "How can you fail to recognise the child you have yourself brought into being even though he be grown a giant?"

Let us, therefore, attempt to put our own house in order, for it still needs much organisation, arrangement and alteration.

done this, we should have some right to correct ourselves

CAUSES OF AGITATION

Take the Turkish question for example. Its unenviable position of the present day is charged to the greed of other Powers but whose is the primary, no less than the ultimate responsibility if not that of the Sultan's loyal (save the mark) advisers? If Turkey had only remained neutral like Afghanistan and other countries, would it have had to face the present debacle? One cannot take all that as gospel but there must be some truth in what is stated in Morgenthau's book 'Secrets of the Bosphorus' as regards the condition in Turkey which have led to its imminent disruption. The saddest part of it all is that the poor Sultan and his State stand to be sacrificed in consequence of the nefarious designs, personal ambitions and the crooked machinations of his people and his Ministers. What fate these arch conspirators deserve we refrain from saying.

But let alone Turkey and the affairs of a distant continent and let us look nearer home to the Punjab. How things began and where they ended? The Rowlatt Bill was the starting point the next stage the prohibition of Mr Gandhi from entering the Punjab. We cannot help feeling that this worthy has been made the target of much opprobrium beyond his desert.

The public forget that the Rowlatt Bill was forged as a weapon to defeat the criminal it was never intended to be directed against any one who in thought and act conformed to the ordinary standards of peaceable society. This point was ignored and violent opposition ensued in consequence of the absence of trust in the motives of the bureaucracy. A contributory cause of the distrust was the power for mischief possessed by the Police with its resultant desire to save one's skin and honour.

It is not intended here to heap unmerited obloquy on the Police or to cast reflections upon it: it is merely desired to point out the extent to which it enjoys the confidence of the public in the matter of sparing the innocent and tracking down the wrong-doer. The Police is the primary protector of our lives and property and we sympathise with that body if to any extent, it is merely scape-goat but whipping boys are a royal institution.

Anyhow, neither the Rowlatt Act, nor the prohibition laid upon Mr. Gandhi were a sufficient reason for criminal trespass and house-breaking or arson and incendiarism. It was this excess which led to the employment of troops for the restoration of order and then as by natural antecedence and consequence came the commission of excess by the leaders of the Army itself.

NO OTHER WAY?

The question to ask is, whether the only modes open of obtaining the repeal of the Rowlatt Act and of expressing resentment at the exclusion of Mr. Gandhi from the Punjab, were those adopted by the people? Anyhow, the consequence of initiating violence was that the people to-day have to mourn the loss of hundreds of innocent lives, hundreds more had to be thrown into prison—finally General Dyer has been relieved of his command, and yet, has the original object been gained?

what it is reprisals must be expected when the other side get a favourable opportunity.

Let us dwell upon the other side of the shield for a moment. God alone knows what untold miseries will not yet follow in the wake of the false idea of prestige, nonchalant superciliousness and the obstinacy which is mistaken for strength?

But what will be will be. Let the people of this country adopt the sound course and do the right thing. Let us eschew all violence and adhere to the peaceable method, keeping our eyes steadily fixed upon the goal—the goal ordained by Providence, the appointed and inevitable goal of twin aspect, namely, strengthening the foundations of the Sovereignty under which a Wise Dispensation has placed us, and improving the moral and material condition of our beloved Motherland, until in trade and commerce, arts and industries as well as in other departments of modern civilised activity we can hold our own against the countries that lie outside our magnificent Empire.

It is not denied that this is the slow and not the expeditious method but for that reason it is also the halcyon and not the cataclysmal one.

JAPANESE PREPARATION.

It is common knowledge that Japan, which now ranks as a first-class Power, commanded no influence until she had equipped herself with the organisation and acquired the qualities which distinguished the European Powers—such as financial resourcefulness and expending indigenous trade, on the practical side and appreciation of international justice together with the determination to see a thing through, on the ethical and moral side. Immediately this came about, the Japanese were, willy nilly, admitted to the comity of Nations.

It must also be remembered, and this is a very important fact—that the Japanese went to foreign countries to learn, to borrow ideas, but he borrowed them to improve and apply to his own country. He competed in art, he competed in industry, no less than in practical methods of administration and competed successfully. Let us ask ourselves the question and fairly answer it? Have we attained any thing like the degree of advancement which Japan—an eastern nation—admittedly possesses?

What do we find in fact? A great many of our countrymen have gone to England to be educated in practical sciences but on their return they have neither met with any appreciation of their knowledge nor with any confidence in their capacity. They are passed over by ourselves in favour of Europeans. Therefore, our conclusion is that if we have made any progress it is only in the matter of smart speech and demagoguism. In this respect, honourable exceptions barred, our people generally are adapts and past masters. As for the exception, one in a hundred how much does it count?

The strange thing is that when expressed in the form of a general proposition, the majority of our people are only too ready to assent to the ravaging possibilities of the destructive tendency, and the potentiality for good of the constructive one, and yet the public speaker who denounces the entire order of things gets the largest audience and the readiest hearing, so also the vilifying rabid type of paper has the largest circulation. The fair minded critic and the soberly conducted paper are both outcasted.

OUR RESPONSIBILITIES

This brings us back to the question—now not so hotly debated—should the school boy with his immature mind be allowed to dabble in politics? If not, a great

responsibility rests over the shoulders of our orators and journalists, in the matter of keeping the young mind untainted—for their utterances and their ebullitions not only reach but influence them, without doubt

The important thing in any society is the pervading tone and the atmosphere and we certainly want a higher tone in politics and a less heated atmosphere

We think that the responsibility of the public speakers and writers is very great indeed—it is in their power not only to mislead the present young generation but if they do so, they occasion the wrong-headedness of the future ones too, and if they don't take their responsibility seriously they will have to answer to the Supremo Being

That brings us to the next point—This is a very Godless age, people are too well educated to believe in a God. Call it eastern fatalism or intellectual deficiency, or what you will, but the experience of centuries has yielded the conclusion that what is ordained that alone will come to pass

Anyhow, on a comprehensive view of the whole situation through the medium of these disconnected, discursive and apparently incoherent jottings, the writer, an humble and destitute Native of this country, begs of the reader, in all humility, to take the line of least resistance which is also the line of pacific and steady advance. Of course two conditions are essential to our progress, one is a consistent policy and the other perseverance in the pursuit of our aims

So far, we take short sighted views and our capacity is very limited too. We have neither enterprise nor even unity. In fine, we have much to learn as well as much to unlearn in the latter respect, self advertisement before all else

Until India and England the country with which we should properly feel proud to be associated, confes-

and become thoroughly identified in their aims, no substantial progress will be attained. The pulling opposite must stop.

A SOCIAL FORUM.

Supposing that this end were attempted to be gained through the medium of a social meeting ground how would it do?

It is suggested that an Institution, called after His Majesty the King Emperor, be founded and housed in the Imperial City of Delhi. The Institution should offer every kind of relaxation and every opportunity of social intercourse.

It should be an imposing structure with the usual apartments: 1 Drawing Room 2 Dining Hall 3 Billiard Room 4 Card Room 5 Writing Room 6 Ball Room 7 Library 8 Tennis Court 9 Badminton Court 10 Carriage Shed 11 Kitchen, etc., etc., the Dining Hall being convertible into a Lecture Hall. Membership shall be open to people of all races, European and Indian.

It is not an out-of-the-way hope to entertain that the foundation of such a Club would not only promote social intercourse but actually engender good-fellowship and bring about a better mutual appreciation of aims as between the two principal races. It would afford, as a means of attaining this end, the opportunity of exchange of ideas. In short it can only do good and no harm of any sort. It is every one's experience that involved and intricate matters are more happily settled in short informal conversations than by formal representations or voluminous official correspondence.

It is trusted that the idea will be earnestly taken up and such good progress made towards its materialisation as to justify the laying of the foundation stone by His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales.

His Majesty the King Emperor and His Excellency the Viceroy should be requested to honour the country by consenting to be the Patron and the Vice-Patron respectively of this Institution.

If the idea catch on, the destitute writer will struggle and put up one lakh of rupees towards the accomplishment of the idea

If not, then it is as He wishes

(Published in "The Times of India," dated 26 6-1920.)